Who Says
AKBAR
Was Great ?
P. N. OAK

Who Says Akbar Was Great ?

By

P.N. OAK

HINDI SAHITYA SADAN
30/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001 (India)

Some Other works by the same author—

1. Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research
2. Agra Red Fort Is A Hindu Building
3. World Vedic Heritage
4. Some Missing Chapters of World History

P.B. — Rs. 225.00
H.B. — Rs. 300.00

Publishers : **Hindi Sahitya Sadan Ph. : 3340064**
Distributors : **Hindi Sahitya Sadan**
30/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001
Edition : June 2000
Printers : Goyal Enterprises, Shahdara, Delhi-32 Ph. : 2225770

CONTENTS

PREFACE

In the preface to his eight-volume critical study of mediaeval Muslim chronicles a well-known historian, the late Sir H.M. Elliot observes that the history of the Muslim era in India is an "impudent and interested fraud."

But a mere vague realization of a fraud is not enough. It has to be fully probed for a proper appraisal of its gravity.

Instances are not wanting of exposed pick-pockets dexteriously picking the pockets of the very constables leading them handcuffed to lock-ups.

Similarly Western scholars like Sir H. M. Elliot, who have seen through the "fraud" have still been duped by mediaeval Muslim claims in many respects. For instance they have failed to realize that as in other spheres tall claims made in favour of mediaeval Muslim rulers that they founded cities and built tombs and mosques by the hundreds are also "frauds." All extant mediaeval buildings whether forts, palaces, mansions, mosques or tombs are of pre-Muslim Rajput origin. Historians, architects and archaeologists have blundered, for example, in believing that Fatehpur Sikri and the Red Forts at Agra and Delhi were founded by Mogul emperors. In my book titled "Taj Mahal was a Rajput Palace" and its successor volume titled "The Taj Mahal is a

Hindu Palace." I have already exposed the "fraud" that shrouds the 'tallest' of the mediaeval monuments namely the Taj Mahal. My other book "Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research" also exposes some other frauds or misconceptions.

The present book on Akbar is intended to expose yet another "fraud" glibly palmed off, namely that Akbar was a noble man and a great king. He was neither. Historical evidence led in this book goes to prove that far from ranking as a man and ruler of exemplary conduct Akbar cannot be classed even with ordinary law-abiding and God-fearing citizens. He was a law unto himself. On a proper assessment he turns out to be one of the most tyrannical, cruel, crafty and immoral rulers in world history,

Closed minds who consider all questions as finally settled, are likely to brush aside Akbar's appraisal in this book, as biassed. Such an attitude is derogatory to the search for truth.

Because of a time-lag of almost 400 years this author could have had no reason or occasion for any personal tiff or brush with emperor Akbar. I would have, in fact, been very happy and grateful to Divinity had Akbar really qualified for greatness. It would have spared millions of his abject subjects so much misery, torture and humiliation. And a total foreigner that he was, it would have been a matter of universal admiration and unique distinction for him to love as his own

children—as is fatuously claimed—millions of people who had nothing in common with him in the matter of religion, culture and nationality.

But on a careful study of historical works on Akbar I have felt that to clothe him in raiment of nobility and Divinity, putting him on a pedestal, and throwing a halo of greatness around him is doing a great disservice to logic,history, historical research and TRUTH.

Misinterpreting events, failing to size them up in their logical context and losing sight of contemporary notings about Akbar's atrocious career and Machiavellian mental make-up, is not only unsemantic but is an insult to human intelligence. But that is exactly what most histories of Akbar's reign have done. Most of them have been haunted by the panegyric gloss of Abul Fazal's *Akbarnama*. They haven't had the courage or insight of Western scholars who correctly regard the Akbarnama to be a tissue of lies. Abul Fazal's own contemporaries, fellow-chronicler Badayuni and Prince Salim, call him a "shameless flatterer." Blochmann remarks in the preface to his translation of Abul Fazal's Akbarnama that "Abul Fazal has far too often been accused by European writers of flattery and even wilful concealment of facts damaging to the reputation of his master".

I wish to point out that in coming to my conclusions on Akbar's place in history I have relied solely on the evidence recorded by preceding historians. My own contribution is limited only to sifting that evidence from piles of glittering, motivated and interested falsehoods, compiling

and marshalling it and adding explanatory observations to rub off the false gloss put on gory and bizarre episodes and affairs.

My findings are of far-reaching importance inasmuch as they fell with the sledge-hammer of TRUTH a part of the false and seductive facade and ceiling carefully hiding the skeletons and filth in the Akbar cupboard of Indian history.

Historians would do well to lift their heads from under the sands of myths, and have a second look and entertain second thoughts on India's mediaeval history, to fathom, what Sir H. M. Elliot calls, its many "frauds."

This book does not claim to be a complete chronological narrative of Akbar's life or reign. It deals with Akbar's historical role with a difference. The scope of this book is limited to forcefully impressing on all concerned that Akbar's image projected through official dossiers, institutional literature and academic text books is totally unwarranted and far removed from facts.

This book aims at lifting the thinking on Akbar from its traditional ruts. Incidentally it also achieves—as I see it—a cohesive and rational reconciliation of seemingly contradictory or incompatible currents running through narratives of Akbar's reign.

Falsification of facts, glossing over of unedifying episodes and wishful interpretation of events is bound to result in an unsatisfactory, unconvincing hotch potch. This is the feeling one gets on reading the usual run of books on Akbar.

Pulled on one side by the traditionally dinned-in juvenile notions of Akbar's fancied greatness, and on the other by damaging facts learned through mature, adult reading, writer after writer has betrayed confusion and contradiction in his writings on Akbar, page after page. For instance, on page 63 of his book *Akbar the Great*, Vol. I, Professor Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastava hails Akbar's so-called marriage with the daughter of the Jaipur ruler, Bharmal, as "a significant event in mediaeval Indian history inasmuch as it was a voluntary affair on both sides." And within half-a-dozen lines the learned professor somersaults and asserts "It must however be said that the proposal had emanated as Bharmal was hard-pressed and wanted to save his family and state from ruination."

Such confusion results from an inadequate understanding and wrong interpretation of Akbar's basic urges and motives.

The test of TRUTH is that it should reconcile all seemingly incompatible contemporary evidence into a homogenous whole, without leaving any loose, dangling ends. This is what, I feel, I have succeeded in doing in this book thereby providing an unfailing key to the proper understanding and interpretation of Akbar's actions and behaviour in particular and of Muslim rule in India, in general.

—**Peno**

THE NEED FOR REASSESSMENT

AKBAR, the third generation Mogul emperor of India, who lived from 1542 to 1605 A.D., has often been represented as a great man and a noble king. This assessment of his personality is thoroughly unjustified.

Had it been a mere matter of opinion or of degree it wouldn't have mattered very much if those who considered Akbar 'Great' chose to hail him as such. But he was the very antithesis of greatness and nobility of character.

If a person donates, let us assume, Rs. 2 for a charitable cause it would certainly be a matter of opinion whether or not to glorify him as a generous donor. If the donor is earning just enough for mere subsistence his donation of even a modest Rs. 2/- could be classified as a generous gift. On the other hand if the donor were a millionaire a donation of Rs. 2/- by him would have to be classed as a ludicrously low amount. But all said and done he would still have to be bracketed with donors, generous or otherwise. But when throughout a person's life he is all along engaged in usury and extortion without ever parting with so much as a farthing of his own, by no stretch of imagination can he be glorified as a donor, and a generous one at that.

Such is the case with Akbar's assessment in

Indian or world history. Not a single act of his was free from cruelty, treachery, craving for wealth or lust for conquest. And yet he is cited as an exemplary ruler and an adorable man. It is this perversion which rankles.

Whenever such supposedly well-settled issues are raked up for re-consideration it is too easily assumed that the person urging the review must be actuated by malice or bias. It is conveniently forgotten that there could be something like an honest re-appraisal, righteous indignation for falsehood, and a solicitous concern for truth.

Among others who fail to see the need for a reappraisal are those who seem to argue that since Akbar is dead and gone why worry about branding him, even assuming that he was a miscreant? From a lay point of view this may be considered to be sound advice. But on closer scrutiny it would be found that the suggestion is not as simple and innocuous as it looks. It is not this author who wants to disturb the ghost of Akbar's memory, for whatever it may be worth, had it been allowed by universal consent to rest in oblivious repose. In spite of ourselves we find that the ghost of Akbar's greatness continues to be revived and foisted on generation after generation of school and college students. The myth of Akbar's greatness is being constantly rubbed into the minds of the people through classroom lessons and test papers and other literature. In social and governmental business Akbar is held aloft as an ideal monarch and a praiseworthy individual. When the ghost of his memory is thus being continually

revived and sought to be hoisted on a public pedestal for compelling obeisance a check-up on whether the faith in Akbar's greatness is warranted by facts becomes not only relevant but imperative.

To those who seem to say "why rake up the past...let bygones be bygones" we have other suitable replies too. They ought to realize that history is nothing else but raking up the past. Moreover, they ought to know that they or their relations cannot get away from test papers in history in institutional or public service examinations by scrawling a note across their answer papers saying "Dear Mr. Examiner—Since Akbar is dead and gone why bother your own head and mine by asking me to write about his reign". This shows that whether we like it or not history is going to be with us. If that is so it is the duty of every right-thinking individual to see that all that is written or spoken in the name of history is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The very object of teaching or studying history is to draw appropriate lessons from the past, that is avoid past mistakes, and derive inspiration from whatever has been glorious. This very object is defeated if history is sought, as it very often is in India out of mistaken notions of secularism and inter-communal harmony, to be blurred or glossed over, suppressed or misrepresented and misconstrued.

All knowledge is a ceaseless search for the truth, and history is a search for the truth about a

country's past. Reassessing Akbar's role should not, therefore, be misunderstood to be an attempt at character assassination. What this book tries to do is review Akbar's life and reign to find out whether Akbar had any 'character' at all to laud. Any reappraisal of a personality as well-known as Akbar would have to be supported with factual evidence as recorded in history books. We fully realize this responsibility and willingly accept the challenge.

Over the centuries accounts of Akbar's incriminating acts of commission and omission have been carefully torn to shreds and swept under his royal carpet. Those bits are not easy to salvage and piece together in the blaze and glamour of the red carpet which hides them. Attempts to salvage them have often met with only partial success because many vital bits have been found missing. Piecing them together is another laborious task. And lastly such piecing together is a thankless task which far from bringing any reward, laurels or patronage is frowned upon in many quarters. It is because of such difficulties that practically every historian has discreetly chosen to toe the traditional line of glorifying Akbar, as the best part of academic valour and called it a day.

A few Western scholars, well-intentioned and having the courage of their conviction, because they were free people, no doubt, possessed the impartiality to attempt an honest appraisal but they unfortunately lacked the intuition and insight necessary to sense and fathom the alien Muslim invaders' innate and intense hatred for the Indian

people and the invaders' illimitable capacity to destroy all ancient records and implant their own spurious versions in Indian history. Even those like Sir H.M. Elliot who had the insight to detect the perversion and falsification as an "impudent and interested fraud" could not fathom its depth and trace its ramifications.

In India the term 'historian' is very often abused. All those who earn money through teaching or administering history by virtue of their employment in a school, college, university or the archaeological and archives departments or by writing books on history do not qualify to be termed 'historians.' The real test is whether history is in a person's blood and bones, whether he is constantly pondering over its missing links and inconsistencies, whether he is striving to find new evidence to fill up the blanks, and whether in so doing he is bringing to bear on history a fresh, uninhibited, original outlook not wedded to any dogma or creed? Such a yearning naturally presupposes a little out-of-the-way love for and identification with the country and the people whose history is being investigated, and not a mere mercenary connection with the teaching or administering of history.

Incidentally this principle automatically explains why the Turks, Arabs, Afghans, Abyssinians, Mongols, Uzbeks, Kazaks and Iranians who invaded and occupied India for over a thousand years had no scruples in falsifying India's history. They had no love lost for India, its culture or people

They came and stayed to exploit it to its utmost. They were like dacoits and the assertions made in their chronicles have to be handled very carefully. But what we find is just the opposite. Mediaeval Muslim chronicles, which a discerning historian like Sir H.M. Elliot was constrained to term as "impudent and interested frauds," have been treated as sacrosanct source materials for piecing together India's history.

A student of Indian history is likely to ask in despair that if earlier Hindu records have been burnt or otherwise destroyed by the Muslim invaders, and if the chronicles written by the invaders themselves are not to be believed in what remains as the source for the reconstruction of Indian history? Fortunately we don't have to throw our hands up in despair. Those very falsified chronicles contain all the evidence we need to reconstruct history on the chassis of truth.

This leads us to the great importance of the law of evidence for historical research. A clear understanding of how evidence is sifted, graded and pieced together in a court of law is essential for historical study.

Let us take the example of an unidentified dead body lying unclaimed on a public highway. The investigating machinery perfected over the centuries by human ingenuity goes into action. A note is found on the body saying that the victim has committed voluntary suicide for which none need be blamed and no investigation be undertaken. At the same time a stab wound is noticed

in the victim's back. Here logic tells the investigator that since no man can fatally stab himself in the back the note is a fake and that it is a clear case of murder. This gives us one very important law of judicial investigation which is very useful in historical research. That law is that whenever circumstantial evidence conflicts with a so-called document the document is a clear forgery. Here the word 'document' should include not only writings on parchment but stone and copperplate inscriptions and all other written record. This very important law of evidence should alert the student of history from putting implicit faith in any inscription or writing. It should also enable him to prefer circumstantial evidence and reject the conflicting writing. If this important law is kept in view many Muslim inscriptions and other writings in India will be easily detected to be motivated forgeries.

At some places though the inscribers or writers themselves have made no claims scholars of Indian history have committed the grave error of connecting the writing with the creation of the monument. Thus, for instance Akbar's inscription on the Buland Darwaza (gateway) at Fatehpur Sikri, recording his victory over the Deccan, has been unwarrentedly interpreted by historian after historian to imply that Akbar erected the lofty stone gateway to commemorate his victory over the Deccan. This speculation could never lead to any decisive conclusion since the very assumption that the inscription on it commemorates the creation of

the gateway is wrong. Here the historian needs to recollect that it is a common human failing to etch one's own name or other legends at picnic spots or over historic buildings. Akbar's inscriptions on the Buland Darwaza are only a royal version of this common human weakness. He wrote about his victories on the slate of an earlier Hindu gateway. Vincent Smith also records in his book titled "Akbar the Great Mogul" that Akbar used to have masons and carvers at his command to engrave the inscriptions he desired.

Introducing a slight variation in the example cited above we shall explain to the reader how a document even though genuine would not be enough to justify an event. Let us assume that the person whose body is found lying unclaimed had started from his home with a genuine note written and signed by himself saying that he was going out to commit suicide which need not be investigated. Even in such a case if the man has died of a stab wound in the back it can clearly be inferred that though the man left his house with the intention of committing suicide, before he could carry out his resolve he was intercepted and murdered. In this case very curiously the 'suicide document' is genuine and yet the death is not suicide but murder. This gives us another valuable law of evidence that a document may be genuine but its connection with the event could be spurious. In this case too the circumstantial evidence will be crucial.

The Indian Criminal Procedure Code lays down

very valuable guidelines on how 'confessions' are to be appraised as evidence. That code specifically enjoins upon a magistrate to impress upon a suspect that he is under no obligation to make a confession but if he made a confession or recorded any statement it would be definitely used against him but never in his favour. Muslim chronicles are in the nature of 'confessions,' and it is left to the appraiser, the historian to feel free to use it the way he likes. It would not lie in anybody's mouth to insist that those chronicles should either be wholly believed or wholly rejected. This is never done. Evidence is never a package deal.

In the two instances we have mentioned above the so-called suicide notes are absolutely useless as evidence to shield the arraigned murderer. Yet those notes won't be thrown away as trash. They are very valuable evidence in the hands of the prosecution to trace the other accomplices and the circumstances of the murder.

It will thus be seen that while a written record can prove very valuable in bringing the crime home to the wrong-doer it can seldom if ever be used in his defence. In Indian history on the contrary the written word has been taken to be gospel truth without bothering to confront or corroborate it with circumstantial evidence. It is this primary slip in the proper evaluation of evidence that has led to many irrational, irreconcilable, absurd and anomalous conclusions in Indian history.

The general rule of worldly caution respected in the law of evidence, is that in a confession (i.e.

any voluntary statement) the confessor is bound to say everything to save his own skin which need not be believed. But if in the course of that statement he has allowed some hints to fall which implicate him they can certainly be used to incriminate him, and will be regarded and made use of as very strong evidence.

Carrying our discussion a step further we shall now point out, this time in favour of the suspect or accused, that at times even a clear confession is inadmissible as evidence to incriminate the accused. Let us take a hypothetical case in which a long-married Hindu couple is sitting in the drawing room of their home. A visitor happens to come and the conversation develops into a violent quarrel in which the host murders the visitor. As a good Hindu wife who always prefers to pre-decease her husband the wife helps the husband to abscond and tells the police that she murdered the visitor. In such a case though the wife is apparently the murderer yet a court of law trying her would not place much reliance even on her own incriminating confession. In such a case the judge will have at the back of his mind the possibility of a Hindu wife impersonating for her husband as the real criminal. It will also consider the fact that a Hindu wife is not prone to commit murders, She is not generally involved in violent quarrels with outsiders; she does not generally handle murder-weapons; that a woman won't generally murder a man, etc. etc. Thus the court will be very chary in using even a clearcut confession as evidence of the crime.

These instances should suffice to convince a

historian that as a man of the world he is at full liberty to use his discretion and wisdom in accepting or rejecting the whole or any part of evidence tendered. It can never lie in the mouth of the suspect or accused or a partisan witness to insist that the judge, appraiser or historian accept or reject the whole evidence. In a court of law all evidence is properly sifted. It is never treated as a package. Sometimes valuable hints from it are taken while the rest is rejected as trash. At other times the whole statement is used ruthlessly to confront and contradict the accused at every stage but never in his favour.

If, therefore, in the subsequent pages of this book the reader finds us sometimes quoting a partisan chronicler like Abul Fazal or Badayuni to bring home to Akbar his many misdeeds, and at others we refuse to accept at their face value the assertions of those chroniclers we do so on very sound grounds explained above. In fact not using such discretion and caution to winnow, select, sift and appraise all the evidence would amount to committing the greatest academic folly and grave injustice in the field of academic learning, and in the search for truth.

After having explained the importance of the law of evidence in historical research we shall now turn to the other equally important requirement namely logic. For instance, to anybody who asserts that Akbar was great and noble we would like to put a few questions. The first question is that if the present 20th century parliamentary democracy

evolved very gradually from mediaeval barbarism, and if emperor Aurangzeb who died in 1707 A.D., is himself known to have been very barbarous and cruel, how could his great grandfather Akbar who preceded Aurangzeb by over 100 years be described as the very epitome of all virtues? And if at all Akbar was such an ideal man what made his son, grandsons and great grandsons turn out to be virtual beasts? The second question we would like to pose is that when princes born and bred in a country's own ancient tradition very seldom blossom into ideal rulers how could Akbar, alien in parentage, religion, culture and mentality develop an inordinate love for the Indian people? And if he developed such a love did he merge or identify himself w th the religion, language and culture of the vast majority of the people he ruled over? The third question we should like to pose is that can a drunkard and a drug-addict who is illiterate and who swallows principality after Indian principality for no ostensible reason except self-aggrandizement be a man with noble motives? Fourthly we should like to ask that if an invading gang of dacoits claims that it looked after the children of a village with tender filial care better than their slaughtered parents could, will any man endowed with reason pay any heed to that claim? Likewise when histories claim that Akbar who killed or conquered one Indian ruler after another did so only to lavish more loving care on the Indian people than those slaughtered or conquered Indian rulers ever could one must at once dismiss such a claim as nonsensical.

Another easy tally to assess Akbar's role in

history is afforded by his relations with Rana Pratap. Both were sworn deadly enemies of one another. If then Rana Pratap is to be admitted as a patriotic, brave, and righteous son of the soil who fought, back-to-the-wall to save Hindusthan from foreign domination, does it not follow that Akbar was an alien villain who wanted to murder Rana Pratap like many others, for self-aggrandizement and for ensalving Hindudom?

We thus see how logic alone is enough to debunk and expose spurious claims in history. Armed with logic and the law of evidence when we study accounts of Akbar's reign we come across staggering proof to corroborate to the hilt our surmise that as the great grandfather of Aurangzeb Akbar was even worse than the former. For a proper study and understanding of history, therefore, it is not so much documents as logic and the law of evidence which are indispensable. Logic and the law of evidence enable us to locate the needle of truth in a haystack of false writings.

Having seen how an accurate reconstruction of history is possible from even falsified records we would like to indicate how a reappraisal of Akbar's role assumes considerable importance.

Firstly such a reappraisal is necessary in the interest of truth, to put the record of history straight.

Secondly requirements of logic compel us to debunk absurd and illogical conclusions from available evidence of Akbar's reign.

If such wrong conclusions are allowed to persist they sully the rationality of man, and make him prone to accept and put up with similar illogical deductions in all fields of knowledge and education.

Thirdly, if Akbar is to be accepted as great and noble Rana Pratap, Rani Durgawati and a host of other Hindu princes and princesses would have to be classed as villains who wantonly opposed the 'great and noble' Akbar.

Fourthly the presumption of Akbar's greatness amounts to saying that an alien could love and nurture his Hindu subjects better than their own rulers.

Fifthly, it would connote that an illiterate monarch who had all the vices on earth could still be very loving, considerate and efficient.

Sixthly, it leads to the absurdity that though Akbar's ancestors and descendants were all very cruel yet he alone was almost a saint, an angel and an ideal man.

If Akbar was so noble how did his sons, grandsons and great grandsons turn out to be vicious sadists? How were all of Akbar's Muslim courtiers and generals vicious and cruel?

Such anomalies and contradictions which follow from the assumptions of Akbar's greatness and nobility if thrust down the throat of generations of students, they will permanently impair and benumb students' rationalism and make them

prone to accept any silly, readymade conclusions without questioning. This is what has actually happened in India in the field of history. False notions of secularism and Hindu-Muslim amity have permanently incapacitated and precluded students and scholars, teachers and professors, authors and orators from prying deeper into true history. Such terror which prevents any free questioning and cross-examination of long-standing dogmas and shibboleths is unacademic. The late American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had said that to be able to find the truth, one must feel free to search for it. A student or teacher of Indian history has never felt free to pry into true Indian history. His inquiring faculty has been deadened and his voice has been gagged so that he may accept unquestioningly all that is dinned into his ears even if it be illogical and un-scientific. The pathetic belief in Akbar's nobility also makes nonsense of the Law of Evidence.

A reappraisal of Akbar's role thus assumes great importance not only for a correct understanding of that sordid chapter but also for academics in general.

Our two earlier books: The Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace; and Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research, have attempted cleaning some other parts of the Augean Stables of history.

It is hoped that this book would prove to be yet another beacon in reconstructing history so that its other chapters may be equally purified by eliminating the dross of falsehood contaminating them.

A CHRONOLOGY OF AKBAR'S REIGN

A chronological survey of the main events of Akbar's reign is necessary before we proceed to discuss his roles as man and king to evaluate his place in history. It may, however, be stated that the various dates given hereunder are all approximate. Though there have been ever so many chroniclers who have recorded the events of the lives and reigns of mediaeval Muslim rulers, courtiers and princes yet they differ hopelessly on the dates and events they narrate since they were mainly concerned with eking out a soft living in those dangerous and turbulent times by humouring their patrons, by recording and reading out to them concocted, flattering panegyrics in callous disregard of accuracy or truth.

[1]*Thursday, November 23, 1542*: Akbar was born at Umarkot[1] in Sind where his father Humayun, having been defeated by Sher Shah, and made to flee leaving his crown and throne in India, had sought the hospitality of the local Hindu chieftain Rana Virisal alias Rana Prasad. Akbar's name at

1. Vincent Smith says on page 10 of his book "Akbar—The Great Mogul" that many Persian and English authors write the name erroneously as Amarkot. In fact it is Vincent Smith who is wrong. The original name could only be Amarkot. After Muslim occupation it must have been changed to Umarkot to make it appear Muslim in origin.

birth[2] was Badruddin[3] (meaning "The full moon of religion") Mohammad Akbar. The adjective "Akbar" means "very great" or "senior."

March 1546: Akbar was circumcised. Circumcision may have, over the centuries come to be regarded as a sacred and indispensable Muslim religious rite but it owes its origin to necessities of desert hygiene. Since Islam had its birth in the Arabian desert where people could not wash themselves for months circumcision was found as a way out of complaints of phymosis. Circumcision owes its origin, therefore, to the needs of physical hygiene in waterless deserts, and cannot have any religious significance. In countries like India where water is plenty and a daily bath is enjoined as a necessity, circumcision becomes irrelevant even for physical well-being, much more so for spiritual bliss.

Monday, January 27, 1556: Akbar's father Humayun died in Delhi. His death was due to a fall from a staircase of a building inside the Purana Qila on Friday, January 24. He was carried, about

2. Akbarnama gives the date as October 11. On page 13 of his book Smith says that a new official birthday chosen was Sunday instead of Thursday and Akbar's birthday was moved back from November 23 to October 15.

3. On page 13 of his book "Akbar—The Great Mogul" Vincent Smith says that the name Badruddin was later abandoned for Jalaluddin (splendour of religion). Akbar's original name "Badruddin" is now almost forgotten and he is usually referred to in histories as "Jalaluddin Mohammad Akbar."

half a mile away to his palace. He was buried in that palace which is mistakenly believed to have been built after his death. The palace in which Humayun lies buried has the Hindu Shakti Chakra emblem or interlocked triangles, with a stone flower in the centre, depicted on all sides.

Akbar's father Humayun, therefore lived and died in a usurped Hindu palace.

At the time of his father's death in Delhi, Akbar (then 13 years and two months old) was in the Gurudaspur district of the Punjab at Kalanaur, accompanied by his guardian Behram Khan, engaged in military operations against Sikandar Sur.

For about a fortnight the news of Humayun's death was either suppressed or the courtiers took time to proclaim young Akbar king.

February 11, 1556: Akbar was proclaimed king in Delhi in absentia. Three days later that is on February 14, 1556, Akbar was formally enthroned in Kalanaur on the plinth of an ancient Hindu mansion. Vincent Smith is mistaken in observing (on page 22 of his book) that "the ornamental gardens and subsidiary buildings subsequently coustructed and visited more than once by Akbar have disappeared." Such canards of Akbar having built fabulous buildings and townships which have since mysteriously disappeared without leaving any trace have been gullibly believed in and naively repeated by historians like Vincent Smith. The clear explanation is that Akbar was proclaimed king amidst the ruins of ancient Hindu buildings

where Akbar had encamped. Those buildings had been ruined through successive Muslim onslaughts from the beginning of the 8th century A.D.

November 5, 1556: Akbar won the battle of Panipat against the Hindu warrior Hemu, making Akbar the master of the Delhi-Agra-Fatehpur Sikri region. On page 29 of his book Vincent Smith says "Probably Hemu would have won but for the accident that he was struck in the eye by an arrow which pierced his brain and rendered him unconscious. His army scattered and made no further resistance......Hemu's elephant fled to the jungle."

The date of Akbar's first marriage is unknown. According to the practice of marrying the paternal uncle's daughter Akbar was married to Ruqaiya Begum the daughter of his uncle Hindal. He was bethrothed to her in November 1551.

Early 1557: Akbar was married to Abdulla Khan's daughter. This was Akbar's second marriage. His guardian Behram Khan had frowned on this match. This was probably the beginning of the feud between Akbar and his guardian Behram Khan which ended in the latter's assassination.

May 1557: Sikandar Sur surrendered after a long siege of Mankot. It was during this campaign that Behram Khan, the guardian of Akbar, was bethrothed to Akbar's father's sister's daughter Salima Begum. Obviously Akbar had his eye on her because this betrothal so angered him that he ordered the royal elephants to be stampeded into Behram Khan's tent.

A few marches later at Jullundur Behram Khan was married to Salima Begum and again the elephant stampede was repeated to frighten Behram Khan and to give him an indication of having aroused Akbar's green-eyed envy and royal ire.

After return to Agra later again Akbar made an elephant the instrument of bullying his guardian Behram Khan.

1560 A. D. : Akbar removed his seat of government from Agra to Fatehpur Sikri. This clearly proves that Fatehpur Sikri existed before Akbar. The reason for the change is given by the Muslim chronicler Ferishta. He says[4] that Akbar's nurse Maham Anaga accidentally overheard that it was Behram Khan's design to imprison Akbar. Scared by this and no longer considering himself safe in Agra "was the cause which determined Akbar to quit Agra." This shows that all talk and belief that Akbar moved to Fatehpur Sikri just for the heck of it is baseless. He had to quit Agra because he felt himself insecure there. That he could move at short notice to Fatehpur Sikri with bag, baggage, retinue, the entire court, a harem of 5000 women and a menagerie of 1,000 wild animals shows that Fatehpur Sikri was a captured township composed of all the buildings that we see now in it, and some more. It is, therefore, a great blunder of history

4. P. 121, vol II History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India (in four volumes) till the year A. D. 1612, by Mahomed Kasim Ferishta, translated from the original Persian by John Briggs, 1966 reprint, published by S. Dey 59A Shambazar Street, Calcutta-4

to assert or believe that Akbar built Fatehpur Sikri.

January 1561 : Behram Khan was assassinated at Siddhapur Pattan in Gujarat. He was obviously murdered by assassins sent by Akbar since for three years earlier Akbar had vigorously hounded him out of office, stripped him of all power, inflicted several defeats on him in open battles and finally exiled him. Ultimately he was cornered and murdered. Soon after his murder his wife accompanied by her three-year-old son, who later became Abdur Rahim Khan Khanan, was brought to Akbar's harem and forced to play wife to him.

March 29, 1561: Akbar's generals Adham Khan and Pir Mohammad defeated Baz Bahadur the ruler of Mandavgad at Sangrur near Dewas in central India. Great atrocities were committed in this campaign by Akbar's generals.

April 27, 1561: Akbar left Agra post haste because he was informed that Adham Khan had been holding back the women of Baz Bahadur's harem, and choice spoil.

June 4, 1561: Akbar returned to Agra after seizing the women and adding them to his own harem and appropriating the captured booty.

June 1561: Akbar himself led an attack against the people of eight villages in Etah district (Sakit Pargana). In Parokh village a house was set on fire and about a thousand Hindus were burnt to death.

July—August 1561: Akbar undertook an expedition against Khan Zaman (Ali Kuli Khan) governor of Jaunpur and the eastern provinces. He and his brother Bahadur Khan, who were in revolt, were made to surrender. This was the first major revolt against Akbar by his own courtiers. This was to be followed by revolts galore by almost all of Akbar's male relations and subordinates in protest and disgust of Akbar's lechery, treachery, usury and cunning.

January 14, 1562: Akbar left Agra ostensibly to visit saint Moinuddin Chisti's shrine in Ajmer. Obviously Akbar's visits to that shrine were contemporary ruses. His real intention was to reduce the brave and patriotic Rajput rajas to submission one after the other. Some years later when this object was achieved he stopped going to Ajmer.

This first sally of his in Rajasthan was to complete the humiliation and submission of the Jaipur ruler, Raja Bharmal and compel him to surrender his daughter for Akbar's harem. Earlier Bharmal was subjected to cruel and devastating raids by Akbar's general Sharfuddin, and three Jaipur princes were held in captivity under pain of torturous death unless Bharmal consented to surrender his daughter for Akbar's harem, and grandson Mansingh and son Raja Bhagwandas to reside in perpetual tutelage at Akbar's court as hostages to ensure the Jaipur Hindu royal family's permanent submission. This blatant act of kidnapping a princess has been unjustifiably and atrociously glorified in Indian history as a very noble gesture

of forging inter-communal marital ties. We shall deal with this matter in greater detail in a subsequent chapter.

March 1562, A D : Baz Bahadur, the ruler of Mandavgad, finally surrendered and agreed to be a minor courtier at Akbar's court.

May 16, 1562 : A senior nobleman and relation of Akbar bearing the name Shamsuddin Atga Khan was murdered outside Akbar's bed-chamber by Adham Khan who had led Akbar's army in the Sangrur battle. Authorities differ on the date of this incident as on other important dates. The Tabakat-i-Akbari chronicle written by Nizamuddin attributes this gruesome murder to the succeeding year. Some others place it as late as 1565 A.D. Adham Khan was punished by being thrown from the second storey of the palace apartments in the Fort in Agra. Being only half dead, he was again hauled up and hurled down a second time.

1562 A.D. : Akbar asked for a petty sum of Rs. 18 from Khwaja Jahan the treasurer. The latter replied that the treasury was absolutely empty and even that petty amount was not available.

1562 A. D. : Munim Khan the Chief Minister of Akbar rebelled and fled. He was captured at Sarwat in Saharanpur district and reinstated. He was the second grandee of Akbar's court to rebel against Akbar.

November 5, 1562 : Sharfuddin the general who had terrorized and hounded the Jaipur ruler Bharmal in eating his Rajput pride and surrendering

his daughter to Akbar's harem was another notable of Akbar's court to revolt. An army was sent against him and he was hounded away first to Gujerat and then to Mecca.

A few days later Abul Mali, another senior courtier, declared war on Akbar. Like everyone else around Akbar he was of such a beastly nature that at Kabul he married a princess and murdered his mother-in-law.

1563 A.D. : Akbar is said to have been tiger-hunting[5] at Mathura. References to 'hunting' in Muslim chronicles are not to be taken literally. Very often they mean hunting down Rajput rulers. It is common knowledge that military operations are a closely guarded secret. Accordingly hunting expeditions of Muslim monarchs were mere contemporary ruses to throw the people off their guard. This Mathura 'hunting' entry in Muslim chronicles, therefore, only proves that Akbar was at Mathura on one of those missions to destroy Hindu places of pilgrimage. Ancient Mathura has been razed to the ground in successive Muslim invasions. Some of these were by Akbar. It will be shown later that he visited every major centre of Hindu pilgrimage to similarly destroy those places.

January 12, 1564 : A poisoned arrow was shot at Akbar with a view to assassinate him while

5. A footnote on page 47 of Vincent Smith's book "Akbar the Great Mogul" aptly records that "tigers have not been seen near Mathura for many a year." What was Akbar hunting then ?

he was passing alongside the Purana Qila in Delhi on his way from the Nizamuddin shrine to the Red Fort. (The Red Fort in Delhi is a very ancient building and was not built by Shahjahan as is mistakenly asserted). This attempt on Akbar's life was made because he was nosing about to abduct good-looking wives, mothers, sisters and daughters from many families.

March 1564 : Akbar is said to have abolished the Jiziya tax which was levied by Muslim sultans on Hindus for the preceding 800 years. This abolition is a hoax as we will describe later. Akbar is also believed to have forbidden the enslavement of prisoners of war in 1562 and abolished the tax on Hindu pilgrims in 1563. It will be pointed out later that these are canards and motivated myths blindly believed in by writers of history books without undertaking any investigation.

1564 A.D. : Khwaja Muazzam (maternal uncle of Akbar, being half brother of the queen mother Hamida Banu Begam) became the fifth courtier to revolt against Akbar. He was then sent a prisoner to a dungeon in Gwalior fort where he became mentally deranged and died.

September 1564 : Akbar forced Mirza Mubarak Shah, ruler of Khandesh to surrender his daughter for Akbar's harem. This again was no marriage but abduction since the poor, helpless girl was seized and carried away to Akbar's court by the principal eunuch Aitmad Khan.

July 1564 : Abdulla Khan Uzbek who was military governor of the Malwa region became the sixth prominent courtier to revolt against Akbar.

October 1564 : Akbar is said to have ordered a fine city called Nagarchain to be built near Kakrali village seven miles to the south of Agra. Not a trace of the fine buildings and magnificent gardens, he is said to have ordered, can be found anywhere. This is yet another hoax. Akbar did not build even a single building. All buildings, townships, forts, gardens or gateways ascribed to him were usurped or conquered by him from India's Hindu rulers.

1564 : Khan Zaman, a leading courtier rebelled against Akbar. He thus became the seventh leading figure of Akbar's court to revolt.

1564 : Abdun Nabi appointed to look after royal grants to fakirs and other indigent persons, proved to be rapacious and unworthy.

1564 : Akbar ordered his general Asaf Khan to ravage Rani Durgawati's kingdom with a view to annex her excellently governed principality and capture that beautiful queen for his own harem.

Late in 1564 : Twin sons Hasan and Husain were born to Akbar. Though Akbar had a host of fawning chroniclers swarming around him the name of the mother of the twins has not been recorded. The twins died within a month of their birth.

Late in 1564 : Haji Begum alias Bega Begum a childless senior widow of Humayun is said to have left on pilgrimage to Mecca but ordered the construction of Humayun's tomb in the meanwhile. The tomb is said to have been completed when she returned three years later. She was Akbar's foster mother. His own mother's name was Hamida Banu Begam. This building of Humayun's tomb by a childless widow is another canard. Humayun lies buried in the cellar of a captured Rajput palace.

Early 1565 : Akbar is said to have started rebuilding (after demolishing the earlier fort) the Red Fort in Agra. Another version says that as early as 1561-1563 Akbar had started raising some buildings in the fort. But according to Ferishta what the chronicles call "the fort" was the ancient wall surrounding Agra city. Akbar may have ordered a few repairs to the city wall battered at places during successive Muslim invasions. This minor repair work has been fraudulently magnified and misrepresented by erring historians as the rebuilding of the Hindu Red Fort in Agra. That Akbar could start building a whole city of Nagarchain, his foster mother could order a palatial tomb for the deceased monarch Humayun, and that at the same time Akbar could order the demolition and rebuilding of the Red Fort in Agra while engaged in a war against Rani Durgawati and faced with rebellions by many of his courtiers is absurd in the extreme.

1565-66 : Asaf Khan the general who had

ravaged Rani Durgawati's kingdom was another grandee to revolt against Akbar. The wealth he had looted by ransacking the Rani's realm stood him in good stead to fight against his erstwhile, deeply hated sovereign Akbar.

Early 1567: Akbar's brother Mohammad Hakim, ruler of Kabul, invaded the Punjab. Akbar arrived in Lahore in February 1567 to stem his brother's invasion. While at Lahore Akbar organized a grand hunt. All game within a circumference of 10 miles was killed. Akbar enjoyed the murderous sport for five days using the sword, lance, arrows and lasso.

Taking advantage of Akbar's absence from the Delhi-Agra-Fatehpur Sikri region a host of his relations classed as Mirzas and holding high ranks at Akbar's court revolted against him. Akbar had, therefore, to hurriedly leave Lahore to return to Agra.

April 1567 : On his way back while Akbar was camping at Thaneshwar in the Punjab two sects of priests called Kurus and Purus complained to him about a dispute between them regarding the sharing of the offerings made at the local Hindu shrine by an unending stream of pilgrims. Akbar had them lined up armed with swords, sticks and daggers and made them annihilate one another. To ensure that both sides got killed he kept reinforcing the weaker side with a band of fierce, fanatic Muslims and saw to it that both the priestly factions numbering about 800 were

wiped out. Almost all chroniclers unanimously record that Akbar thoroughly enjoyed the 'sport'.

May 1567: Khan Zaman and his brother Bahadur who had been in open revolt for over two years were defeated and killed. Several other adherents of the rebel leaders were executed by being trampled to death by elephants.

May-June 1567 : Akbar ravaged India's richest and most famous Hindu pilgrim centres namely Allahabad and Benaras (Varanasi). People fled in terror as Akbar's armies ran amuck.

July 18, 1567 : Akbar returned to his capital Agra from his 'Operation ravage'.

At about the same time another revolt led by yet another courtier named Iskandar Khan was suppressed. He was another important courtier to revolt besides the other uncountable Mirzas.

September 1567 : Akbar began preparations to invade Chittor. On October 20, Akbar formed his camp extending for 10 miles to the north-east of the Chittor hill.

February 23, 1568: Brave Rajput women burnt themselves in a mass pyre to escape molestation at the hands of Akbar's barbarous Muslim hordes. The next morning Akbar rode into the fortress and ordered a general massacre in which 30,000 were slaughtered. Many thousands were taken prisoner to be turned into slaves. The holy threads of those slaughtered, weighed 74½ maunds.

March 1568 : Akbar returned to Agra.

The Mirzas again rose in revolt

February 1569 : Ranthambhore fort, a stronghold of the Hada section of the Chauhan clan was besieged. Its chief Surjan had to surrender the fort within a month.

August 1569 : Kalanjar fort (in Banda district) in the possession of Raja Ramchand of Bhatha (i.e. Rewa) was besieged and captured. Tansen the famous singer was surrendered by Raja Ramchand to Akbar along with a huge ransom. The Raja was given a jagir near Allahabad and made a vassal.

August 30, 1569 : Salim (the future emperor Jahangir) was born of the daughter of Raja Bharmol of Amber, whom Akbar had kidnapped from Sambhar.

November 1569 : A daughter Khanam Sultan was born.

(Akbar's third son Daniyal was born of a concubine on September 10, 1572, at Ajmer, in the house of Sheikh Daniyal believed to be a saint. There were at least two other daughters. Shukrunnisa Begum who was allowed to marry, and Aram Bano Begum who died unmarried during Jahangir's reign. The daughters are rarely mentioned in accounts of Akbar's reign as is plausible since women were illiterate non-entities

confined in the solitary recesses of the burqa during mediaeval Muslim rule.

April 1570 : Akbar is said to have inspected the newly built mausoleum of his father emperor Humayun, On page 74 of his book Vincent Smith says it took eight or nine years to build. Mirak Mirza Ghiyas was the architect. This is a canard. Humayun lies buried in a captured Hindu palace in which he lived.

June 8, 1570 : A concubine bore to Akbar a son named Murad and nicknamed Pahadi being born on the Fatehpur Sikri hillock.

September 1570 : Akbar is said to have arranged for the enlargement of the fort and the erection of many handsome buildings in Ajmer. The work is said to have been completed in three years. Ajai-Meru is a very ancient Hindu town and all the historic extant buildings there exist from before the 12th century Hindu emperor Prithviraj's time. It may be remembered that this is the precise period when Akbar is said to have launched even the building of Fatehpur Sikri while engaged in incessant wars and suppressing many revolts.

August 1571 : Akbar came and stayed in Fatehpur Sikri says Vincent Smith on page 74 of his book. This proves that majestic and magnificent monuments which we see in our own day in Fatehpur Sikri existed even in Akbar's time and the assertion that he founded that township is a canard.

February 28, 1572 : Rana Pratap the immortal son of India who successfully defied Akbar's might in a longdrawn war of attrition was enthroned at Gogunda, 16 miles north-west of Udaipur. The formal coronation took place a little later at Kumbhalmir fort.

July 4, 1572 : Akbar set out from Fatehpur Sikri on one of his life-long wars of aggression. It may be noted here that Fatehpur Sikri was the place from which he starts though fraudulent Muslim chronicles would have the reader believe that Fatehpur Sikri was a township built by Akbar and that it was completed only in 1583 A.D.

Sirohi the headquarters of the Deora sect of the Chauhan clan was stormed and taken. One hundred and fifty Rajputs deliberately sacrificed their lives in a futile attempt at resistance. Sirohi was famous for the excellence of its sword blades.

November 1572 : Muzaffar Shah III the alien Muslim sultan of Gujarat was captured and his kingdom annexed. His followers were ordered to be trampled to death by elephants.

At Cambay Akbar saw the sea for the first time.

Khan-i-Azam, (Mirza Aziz Koka) foster brother was appointed governor of Gujerat.

The Mirzas led by Ibrahim Husain were in revolt. Surat was one of their centres. Raja Bhagwandas and his adopted son Raja Mansingh were with Akbar in this campaign. Bhagwandas's brother Bhup[illegible] got killed. In recognition of

the service that Bhagwandas rendered to the alien monarch an empty honour conferred on him was the grant of a banner and kettle drums—never before bestowed on a Hindu.

February 26, 1573 : Surat rebels capitulated. The commandant Hamzaban was punished by the excision of his tongue. He was a general in Akbar's father's service.

April 13, 1573 : Akbar leaves Ajmer and arrives in Fatehpur Sikri on June 3.

August 23, 1573 : Akbar had to leave for Gujerat to quell a rebellion led by Mohammad Hussain, an irrepressible Mirza.

Sept. 2, 1573 : The battle of Ahmedabad was fought. A pyramid of more than 2,000 slain heads was raised.

Monday, Oct. 5, 1573 : Akbar returned to Fatehpur Sikri.

1573-1574 : Akbar in concert with Todarmal issued a proclamation for the compulsory branding of all horses so that any and every person owning such a horse automatically became a royal slave bound to be on duty whenever ordered.

October 2, 1573 : The three princes were circumcised at Fatehpur Sikri.

1574 A.D. : Abul Fazal the fawning chronicler of Akbar's court presented himself for the first time before Akbar but did not create much of an impression.

June 15, *1574* : Akbar embarked on a river

voyage to conquer Bihar province. During the rainy season several vessels foundered off Etawa, and 11 off Allahabad. After 26 days' travel Akbar reached Banaras where he halted for three days. At this time news arrived of the capture of Bhakkar fortress in Sind.

March 3, 1575: Tukaroi battle was fought with Daud, ruler of parts of Bengal, Orissa and Bihar. The prisoners taken were massacred and their heads were piled up to constitute eight sky-high minarets.

April 12, 1575 : Munim Khan the general accepted the formal submission of Daud and left him in possession of Orissa,

1574-1575: Gujerat suffered from severe pestilence and famine.

October 1575 : Akbar's wife Salima Sultan Begum (widow of Behram Khan), his father's sister Gulbadan Begum and Akbar's mother (some say 'step mother') Hamida Bano Begum left on a pilgrimage of Mecca. They were detained in Surat by he Portuguese for about a year. The group retur ed in 1582. Gulbadan Begum who is supposed to have written her memoirs has left no record of her experience as a pilgrim. It could be, therefore, that the memoirs that go in her name are a concoction.

A large party of male pilgrims under the charge of a leader was also sent. The novel and costly arran nt was continued for five or six years. The e ror issued a general order that

anyone could go on pilgrimage at State expense (p. 96 Vincent Smith's book "Akbar the Great Mogul").

Mirza Aziz Koka, Akbar's foster brother revolted and was subjected to house-confinement in Agra. He is said to have resented the compulsory branding-of-horses regulation. But there could be many other reasons besides, such as Akbar's licentiousness in helping himself with others' women. Though we have already lost count, since almost all of Akbar's relations and generals revolted against him, we may tentatively class Aziz Koka as the 11th eminent person of Akbar's court who turned a rebel.

July 12, 1576: Daud the Afghan ruler of Bengal was killed in a battle and his kingdom came to an end. The battle was fought near Rajmahal an ancient capital of Hindu Bengal. Those ruins are wrongly attributed to subsequent Muslim rulers. In fact the ancient Hindu buildings are in ruins precisely because of repeated Muslim assaults.

1572-1597 : The titanic struggle between Rana Pratap the immortal hero of Hindudom and the aggressive Akbar lasted for a quarter of a century. Ultimately it was Akbar who withdrew from the struggle while Pratap emerged triumphant and invincible though with a reduced realm.

June 1576 : The famous battle of Haldighat was fought. It was in this battle that Rana Pratap's charger rested his raised front legs on the temple of Jahangir's elephant and as the redoubtable

Rana lunged forward to kill Jehangir with a blow of his long spear Jehangir hid behind the poor mahout who got killed.

November 1576 : A comet with a long tail appeared in the sky and remained visible for a long time.

1577 A. D. : Raja Todar Mal arrived from Gujerat with a party of rebel prisoners. They were executed.

1578 A.D. : Akbar suffered from an epileptic fit though some fawning chroniclers prefer to term it as a strange spiritual trance. His temper became profoundly melancholic.

1579 A.D. : A Zoroastrian theologian, Dastur Meherjee Rana who had become acquainted with Akbar during the siege of Surat in 1573, and took part in some debates at Fatehpur Sikri in 1578 went home early in 1579.

End of June 1579 : Akbar displaced the regular preacher at the chief mosque in Fatehpur Sikri to emphasize his position as both the spiritual and temporal head of his realm.

November 1579 : A mission of Portuguese missionaries left Goa and reached Fatehpur Sikri on February 28, 1580. They presented Akbar with a Bible which he returned at a much later date.

About this time Akbar becoming alarmed at the widespread resentment aroused by his innovations adopted a policy of calculated hypocrisy (Vincent Smith's book, page 130). On his way back from Ajmer he caused a lofty

tent to be furnished as a travelling mosque in which he ostentatiously prayed five times a day as a pious Muslim should

September I, 1579: Akbar issued the infallibility decree declaring himself the absolute temporal and spiritual head in his realm. Within a week he left for what turned out to be his last visit to Ajmer, ostensibly to Khwaja Moinuddin Chisti's tomb. The promulgation of this decree has given rise to the belief in Akbar having founded a new religion called Din-e-Ilahi.

January 1580 : Influential chiefs in Bengal revolted against Akbar. The revolt was brought under control only in 1584.

Mirza Mohammad Hakim, younger half brother ruling in Kabul threatened invasion.

February 8, 1581 : Akbar left Fatehpur Sikri for India's north-west frontier. Shah Mansur, Akbar's finance minister was in league with the potential invader. He thus became the 12th important courtier to revolt. He was hanged by a tree at Shahbad, midway between Thaneshwar and Ambala. Abul Fazal himself acted as the hangman.

August 9, 1581 : Akbar entered Kabul while his half-brother Mohammad Hakim the ruler fled. Akbar started on his return journey after only a six-day stay.

January 17, 1582 : Akbar's step mother died. Since her return from Mecca she is said to have spent most of her time first in the construction and

then in the management of her husband Humayun's mausoleum. (This statement on page 291-92, Vol. I of Dr. Ashirbadilal Shrivastava's book "Akbar the Great" is at variance with other reports that construction had started before she left)

1581-82 A.D. : A large number of Sheikhs and fakirs who resisted Akbar's innovation were exiled, mostly to Kandahar and exchanged for horses, to be enslaved.

March 1582 : Masum Khan Farhankhudi, another important courtier to revolt against Akbar, was murdered one night while on his way from the palace in Fatehpur Sikri despite his having sought and got the protection of Akbar's mother.

1582 A.D. : Hirvijaya Suri, a Jain monk stayed at Akbar's court for some days.

15th April 1582: Daman, a Portuguese possession was invaded by Akbar's forces. A similar treacherous attack on Diu was foiled.

The debates on religion which had commenced in 1575 came to an end in 1582 A.D.

About this time Sayyad Muzaffar accompanied by Father Monserrate was asked to proceed on an embassy to Europe. This was Akbar's way of getting rid of Sayyad Muzaffar. He deserted and concealed himself in the Deccan.

August 4, 1582 : Two Christian youths were murdered in Surat because they refused to accept Islam. A ransom of 1,000 gold coins offered for the release of the Christian youths was refused.

August 1582 : Akbar visited a house where about 20 newly born children, purchased from their mothers, had been brought up in absolute isolation since 1578 under the care of dumb nurses. This was a sadist and whimsical experiment which completely ruined the lives of all those innocent children.

October 15, 1582 : The six-mile long and two-mile broad lake at Fatehpur Sikri burst. Akbar who was at the time engrossed in a birthday party with some courtiers, had a narrow escape from drowning. This burst made the lake go dry. The township having been deprived of its source of water Akbar had to leave it for good in 1585, having found it impossible to live there any more.

Aitimad Khan, another important courtier to revolt, conspired against Akbar with the rebels in Gujerat. He was imprisoned. On expressing repentance he was appointed governor of Gujerat.

Early 1583 : Jesuit priest Aquaviva left Fatehpur Sikri having obtained Akbar's permission to leave, with great difficulty. He was at the court for over three years.

September 1583 : Muzaffar Shah, ex-king of Gujerat captured Ahmedabad and proclaimed himself king. From January 1584 onwards he was successively defeated at Sarkhej and Nanded and later forced to retreat into the sandy wastes of Kutch. He continued to be rebellious until 1591-92 when he was captured. He is then report-

ed to have committed suicide by slashing his throat.

1583 A.D. : Akbar sent a Rajput prince at his court ostensibly on an errand. But hardly had he departed from the court than he is said to have dropped dead. Hearing of his death his beautiful Rajput widow prepared to burn herself on his pyre. Akbar is said to have reached the spot all alone at the nick of the moment, and incarcerated all her relatives ostensibly to save the woman from burning herself on her husband's pyre. This is obviously a hoax. This is yet another episode of Akbar murdering a Hindu prince to drag his wife to his harem.

October 8, 1583 : Akbar celebrated Id-ul-Fitr. At a polo match on the day Raja Birbar was thrown off his horse. Akbar is said to have graciously breathed on him and revived him. This was a part of the many make-believe acts of Akbar wanting to show off some of his vaunted miraculous spiritual powers.

November 1583 : Akbar is said to have built the Allahabad fort and founded a city around it. And his courtiers are also said to have built mansions in the city. The fort and Prayag city are of immemorial antiquity. Crediting them to Akbar speaks of the juvenile naivete with which bland assertions in fraudulent Muslim chronicles have been allowed to disfigure and disgrace text books of Indian history without questioning.

The kingdom of Raja Ram Chandra of Bhatha was ravaged by Akbar's Muslim armies for the third

time, and he was forced to submit by paying personal humiliating homage. Earlier, in 1563 he had to pay a big ransom and surrender the musician Tansen. The latter bitterly wept when virtually dragged away to the Muslim court in Delhi.

A great famine raged in Akbar's territories in 1583.

1584 A.D. : A new era known as the Divine Era was started with retrospective effect beginning March 11, 1556, the first Muslim New Year's day after Akbar's accession. This was a part of Akbar's attempt to assert his unfettered sovereignty and claim to divinity.

Daswant a young handsome Hindu painter tired of the lechery and treachery at the Mogul court ended his life by stabbing himself with a dagger.

July 15, 1584 : Ghazi Khan Badakshahi, a great favourite at Akbar's court, died at Ayodhya. Some of the ancient temples in Ayodhya including the one where he lies buried were converted to mosques and tombs by him.

February 13, 1585 : Prince Salim, (the future emperor Jahangir) was married to Manbai, the sister of Raja Mansingh. From her he had two children. A daughter Sultunnisa Begum died unmarried at the age of 60. Son Khusru, born August 6, 1587, died on January 29, 1622 as a rebel prince imprisoned along with his mother in Allahabad. His so-called tomb in Khusru Bagh is an earlier ruined Hindu palace apartment which first served as Khusru's prison and later as his

tomb. Manbai was apparently murdered in 1604 in a joint conspiracy by Akbar and prince Salim.

December 20, 1585 : Akbar sent an army to subdue Kashmir's ruler Yusuf Khan, and his son Yaqub. The latter,after having stayed as a hostage at Akbar's court, had fled in panic. Two other contingents were sent to conquer the two mountain states of Swat and Bajaur.

The Raushaniya Afghans led by Bayazid fought tooth and nail against Akbar's invading forces.

January 22, 1586 : Birbar was ordered to join the expedition against the Yusufzai Afghans. Zain Khan, a commander of Akbar's forces apparently claims false credit in Muslim chronicles to have built the Chakdara fort in the hilly north-west frontier. Birbar was slain in this campaign. His original name was Mahesh Das. He was born about 1528 A.D. in a poor Brahmin family of the Bhatta clan, in Kalpi town.

A second expedition to subdue the irrepressible Yusufzais was sent soon after under Raja Todarmal's command.

But this only incited all the other Afghan tribes in the region to relentlessly resist Akbar's predatory forces. Mansingh, then at Kabul, was ordered to join the campaign with his forces. He fell ill for a month and was censured for not being able to crush the Afghan tribes. Many tribesmen were slaughtered while those taken prisoner were sold as slaves. The chronicle, Akbarnama fraudulently credits Zain Khan with having built

a series of forts in this area. This tribal revolt continued even beyond 1600 A.D.

February 22, 1586 : Raja Bhagwan Das signed a treaty with the Kashmir ruler Yusuf Khan. Akbar upbraiding Bhagwandas refused tc honour the treaty. Bhagwandas deeply hurt, apparently because of Akbar's faithlessness, stabbed himself. This shows how, contrary to the general belief, every Hindu connected with Akbar's court came to grief.

October 6, 1586 : Akbar's forces led by Qasim Khan entered Srinagar, capital of Kashmir, and indulged in plunder, repression and torture. Yaqub and his father Yusuf Khan continued to harass the enemy by guerrilla warfare.

July 1589 : Yaqub surrendered. Yusuf Khan was released after Kashmir was annexed. The latter was made a minor courtier by Akbar and sent to fight in Orissa.

During his prolonged stay in Lahore Akbar's forces indulging in desecrating and ravaging sorties against defenceless Hindus coerced a number of Hindu rulers of the neighbourhood to sue for peace. Those surrendering to blackmail included: Raja Bidhi Chand of Nagarkot, Parashuram of Jammu, Basu of Mau, Anuradha of Jaiswal, Raja Tila of Kahlur, Pratap of Mankot and a number of other principalities.

It is said, at this time Yaqub of Kashmir was done to death by Akbar by sending to him a

poisoned ceremonial robe, the wearing of which proved fatal.

January 1, 1592 : Little and Great Tibet were forced to accept Akbar's suzerainty. Ali Rai, the chief of Little Tibet was forced to surrender his daughter for Jahangir's harem. The poor girl was brought to Lahore and dumped in Jehangir's harem on the Muslim New Year day.

1585-1588 A.D. : People were reduced to penury and destitution in a vast region.

June 26, 1586 : The daughter of Rai Singh, ruler of Bikaner, was brought to Lahore to be added to Salim (future emperor Jehangir)'s harem though he had been married many times earlier.

November 16, 1586 : Raja Basu of Mau alias Nurpur was subdued a second time. Akbar's repressive and treacherous behaviour had so alienated his officials that he decided hereafter to appoint two governors to each of his twelve provinces so that out of sheer rivalry they may keep finding fault with one another and carry tales to Akbar so that he may keep both in check by pitting one against the other.

Early 1587 : Akbar promulgated a usurious ordinance under which every visitor to court was to present to the sovereign according to his status silver or gold coins equal in number to the years of his age.

July 28, 1587 : Todarmal was stabbed at night by an assailant who bore him a grudge

because of Todarmal's usurious regulations as Akbar's henchman.

August 6, 1587 : Akbar's first grandson prince Khusru was born to Manbai, the Jaipur princess and Jehangir. He led a life of dissipation and revolt and was done to death in captivity later. Manbai was given the Muslim name of Shah Begum.

May 30, 1588 : Akbar's third son Daniyal was married to the daughter of Sultan Khwaja.

August 1588 : Prince Murad became the father of a son named Sultan Rustam.

April 26, 1589 : The famous court musician Tansen died at Lahore after being forced to entertain the court for 27 years. His body first buried in Lahore is said to have been carried to Gwalior later.

April 28, 1589 : Akbar set out on his first visit to Kashmir. Burhanuddin was despatched against the Deccan kingdom of Ahmednagar. Burhanuddin returned unsuccessful.

June 5, 1589 : Akbar reached Srinagar and lived for 36 days in the palace of Kashmir's erstwhile rulers. During the trek to Kashmir Akbar refused to see his son prince Salim. The latter apprehending vengeance from Akbar remained confined to his own tent. Rulers of Little and Great Tibet frightened out of their wits because of Akbar's proximity and an apprehension of fearful raids sent him a large ransom.

October 3, 1589 : Akbar reached Kabul and

stayed there for 48 days. While there he received Todarmal's letter of resignation. Todarmal went and lived in retirement in Hardwar but was later recalled.

November 9, 1589 : Todarmal died in Lahore.

November 14, 1589 : Raja Bhagwandas who caught cold while participating in Todarmal's funeral suffered from vomiting and strangury and died. His sister was Akbar's wife Jodh Bai.

Akbar launched an invasion against Sindh, Kandahar and Sibi (north-east of Quetta in Baluchistan) and captured a large chunk of territory.

End of 1588 A.D. : A campaign was launched against the Afghan ruler of Orissa. Its conquest was completed in 1592.

The Orissa public rose in revolt against Akbar's oppression but were soon suppressed.

The principality of Cooch Behar ruled by a Hindu king, Lakshmi Narayan, was ravaged and he was forced to submit.

July 22, 1592 : Akbar set out on his second visit to Kashmir to quell a local revolt. The rebel Yadgar's head was presented to Akbar before he reached the Kashmir capital. Akbar reached Srinagar on Oct. 7, 1592 and stayed for 25 days.

March 1593 : Akbar's foster brother Mirza Aziz Koka fled from the court ostensibly to visit Mecca. There he was robbed of a large part of

his wealth by Muslim priests of the Kaba. Finding life intolerable even there, he reluctantly returned.

August 5, 1593 : Sheikh Mubarak, father of Abul Faizi the poet and Abul Fazal, the chronicler, died at the age of 88.

October 5, 1595 : The poet Faizi died at Lahore suffering from dropsy, vomiting blood, breathing difficulty and swollen hands and feet.

October 30, 1595 : Hakim Humam, superintendent of Akbar's kitchen, reckoned among the nine eminent people of Akbar's court, died.

April 1, 1597 : Akbar set out on his third visit to Kashmir. Relations between Akbar and prince Salim (Jahangir) were so strained even during this trip that the prince dare not call on his father. A severe famine raged in the vale of Kashmir from May to November 1597 compelling people to flee their homes. The Hindu state of Cooch Behar ruled by Lakshmi Narayan was ravaged and subdued.

May 3, 1597 : A nearby ruler, Raghava Dev (cousin of Lakshmi Narayan) was similarly harassed and subdued.

November 6, 1598 : After over 13 years' stay in the Punjab Akbar left for Agra to pay more attention to the subjugation of the Deccan kingdoms.

May 22, 1599 : Prince Murad died while in a state of coma because of excessive drinking and drugging, at Dihbadi, about 20 kos from Daulata-

bad on the banks of the Poorna river. Akbar sent for prince Salim (Jehangir) to proceed to supervise the Deccan campaign since Murad had died. But Jehangir refused to present himself or proceed to the Deccan.

July 15, 1599 : The Jesuit priest Francis Jerome Xavier requested the emperor at Agra that since he had learned enough Persian he be permitted to hold religious discourses. Akbar snubbed him by saying that permission given to him to speak about his own religion was freedom enough.

September 16, 1599 : Akbar left Agra ostensibly on an hunting expedition but in reality to pressurize prince Daniyal to find time from his lewd life to conduct the Deccan campaign more vigorously.

Jagat Singh of the Jaipur royal family who was to lead an expedition against Bengal died about this time due to excessive drinking and melancholia because of the life of abject slavery and dissolution he had to lead in the Mogul court.

February 1600 : A large army was sent to besiege fort Ashirgarh. The fort was taken through treachery.

July 3, 1600 : Chand Bibi the Muslim queen of Ahmednagar was done to death through intrigue.

August 19, 1600 : Ahmednager fort and city were captured. Two earlier attempts, in 1586 and 1589, had flopped. Burhanul Mulk of Ahmednagar (brother of Chand Bibi) who died in April

1595 was notorious for making inroads on the honour of the families of his officers. In the siege of Ahmednagar by Akbar's forces, which began on December 18, 1595 under Shahbaz Khan, the commander of Akbar's forces, the people of Ahmednagar were molested and their property was looted.

The Mugals plundered a neighbouring town Mungi Pattan. A treaty was negotiated on February 23, 1596. Berar had to be ceded to the Mugals in return for recognition to Bahadur as the feudatory ruler of Ahmednagar. The exasperated people of Ahmednagar plundered Mogul baggage when they began withdrawal on March 20, 1596.

August 1, 1601 Akbar arrived on a flying visit at Fatehpur Sikri and stayed for 11 days.

Jehangir, now over 31 years and 8 months old was in open revolt. From the age of 20 onwards he developed an over-increasing hatred for his father Akbar. On July 8, 1589 when Akbar suffered from a severe colic he moaned in a state of delirium that he suspected his son Jehangir to have administered some poison to him. He also suspected Hakim Humam (reputed to be one of the nine jewels of Akbar's court) to have abetted the poisoning. On May 16, 1597 while staying in Rajouri (a part of Kashmir) Jehangir's body-guard had fought a skirmish with some of Akbar's troops commanded by Khwajagi Fateullah. To assuage Jehangir lest he become more dangerous and uncontrollable Akbar ordered Fateullah's tongue to be cut. Early in 1598 when Akbar ordered him to lead an expedition to Turan

(Transoxania) Jehangir refused point-blank. Towards the end of 1599 taking advantage of Akbar's absence in the Deccan Salim (Jehangir) marched repidly from Ajmer to Agra and then to Allahabad where he set himself up as an independent ruler.

August 9, 1602 : Abul Fazal was ambushed and murdered at Jehangir's instigation, about 35 miles from Gwalior between the villages of Sarai Burki and Antri.

February 7, 1603 : Akbar's father's sister Gulbadan Begum died in her 82nd year.

She has written her memoirs of her brother emperor Humayun's reign.

October 1603 : Prince Salim asked to march against Rana Amar Singh (son of the late Rana Pratap) proceeded some distance and returned under pretence of inadequate troops and equipment.

1604 A.D. : An expedition was sent out against Bir Singh Deo, the chief of Orchha who had organized the ambush against Abul Fazal. Akbar's army was, however, effectively repulsed.

Jehangir's wife Manbai was murdered though she is stated to have committed suicide.

Akbar finding his bed chamber attendant dozing when he stepped in for a siesta, was so exasperated that he ordered the man to be thrown from the parapet of Agra fort and dashed to pieces.

Jehangir was such a sadist that he had a newswriter flayed alive, a page castrated and a domestic servant beaten to death.

August 21, 1604 : Akbar set out for Allahabad to subdue his rebellious son but was forced to turn back midway having received news of his mother's illness.

August 29, 1604 : Akbar's mother Mariam Makani died at the age of 77.

November 9, 1604 : Jehangir (Salim) arrived in Agra on the pretext of paying a condolence visit. His companion Raja Basu of Mau and Pathankot was made a scapegoat and was put under arrest. But the Raja escaped to his principality. Later Jehangir too was put under house arrest and spanked.

March 11, 1605 : Prince Daniyal who refused to return to Agra from the Deccan despite repeated summons from emperor Akbar died, of excessive drinking and drugging.

September 22, 1605 : Akbar fell ill in the palace at Sikandra.

October 15, 1605 : Akbar died at night at the age of 63 after having reigned 48 years, 8 months and 3 days. He had three sons and three daughters. Two of his sons had died. Two daughters: Shahzad (Khanam Sultan) and Shukrun-nissa Begum had been married. The third, Aram Begum died a spinster during Jehangir's rule.

AKBAR'S VICIOUS ENVIRONMENT

All of Akbar's ancestors were barbarous and vicious. And so were his descendants even down to his great grandson Aurangzeb and others down the line. Akbar himself and his contemporaries were links in that chain. As we shall see in the succeeding chapters the tyranny and torture and treachery and horror that Akbar and his generals practised knew no limits.

Born and brought up in an illiterate and barbarous atmosphere which was further fouled by inordinate womanizing and by extreme drink and drug addiction, Akbar could not have been the paragon of virtue that he is made of. And if he at all were to be a freak virtuoso his sons, grandsons and great grandsons would not have been the degenerate sadists that they turned out to be. This is sheer logic. And the conclusions we reach through logic find full corroboration in accounts of Akbar's reign.

Unfortunately India having been under alien rule for over a thousand years, a tradition to write history to suit communal or political expediency, under Government patronage has become so strongly entrenched that writing an unvarnished and straightforward account of India's past is considered a sacrilege. It is, therefore, that Indian history abounds in haphazard, dogmatic, slipshod, absurd and anomalous conclusions and concepts

which crumble at the slightest prodding with logic and the law of evidence. The carefully fostered myth of Akbar's greatness and nobility is one such. Obviously a Muslim Akbar has been artificially boosted as a great and noble ruler to provide a communal counterbalance to the name of the Hindu emperor Ashok who is often hailed in world literature for his piety.

Akbar was descended on the paternal side from Tamerlain, and on the maternal side from Chengiz Khan—two of the world's greatest marauders who made the earth quail under their feet. Justice J.M. Shelat observes[1]: Akbar's "grandfather Babur was the eldest son of Umar Sheikh, the king of Fargana, a small principality on the eastern border of Persia. Umar Sheikh's father was Abu Said, a great grandson of Timur. The first wife of Umar Sheikh and the mother of Babur, Qutlug Nigar Khanum was the second daughter of Yunas Khan, a direct descendant of Chagtai Khan, the second son of the great Mongol Chengiz Khan.

Akbar's grandfather Babur was dreaded like a man-eater and people used to flee in terror in his wake. It will be shown in a subsequent chapter of this book that Akbar himself was rated by his contemporaries as no better than a panther on the prowl, and people fled at his approach.

About Babur Mr. Shelat says[2] "Babur took the city (Dipalpur) putting the entire garrison to

1. Page 1, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat, 1964, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Chowpaty, Bombay.
2. Page 6, ibid.

the sword...[3] Babur's vanguard...beat the enemy, and to strike terror in Ibrahim (Lodi)'s forces (during the former's advance towards Delhi) put them all to the sword" ...[4] Then he quotes Babur: "It was the hot season when we came to Agra. All the inhabitants had run away in terror. Neither grain for ourselves nor corn for our horses was to be had. The villagers, out of hostility and hatred for us, had taken to thieving and highway robbery...[5] By the labours of several years...by deadly slaughter, we beat these masses of enemies..."

Describing the demonaic pleasure which Babur used to derive by raising towers of heads of the people he used to slaughter Col. Tod writes[6] that after defeating Rana Sanga at Fathehpur Sikri "triumphal pyramids were raised of the heads of the slain, and on a hillock which overlooked the field of battle, a tower of skulls was erected; and the conqueror Babur assumed the title of Ghazi."

Terry's account of Asaf Khan's banquet quoted by Vincent Smith says[7] "Intemperance was the besetting sin of the Timuroid royal family, as it was of many other Muslim ruling families. Babur was an elegant toper."

On his own confession Babur was also a sodomite. From all accounts, therefore, Babur, the

3. Page 8, Shelat's book, ibid.

4. Page 10, Shelat quotes Babur's Memoirs, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

5. Page 10, ibid.

6. Page 246, Vol. 1, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, by Lt. Col. James Tod, in two vols.

7. Page 294, Vincent Smith's "Akbar the Great Mogul"

founder of the Mogul dynasty and grandfather of Akbar was no better than a hoodlum.

Babur's own Memoirs contain many confessions of the barbarism that he practised. Here are a few extracts:[8] "We took a number of prisoners (after the battle against the Tambol) whose heads I ordered to be struck off. This was my first battle.[9] Orders were given for beheading such of them (Afghans who surrendered in the battle between Kohat and Hangu) as had been brought in alive, and a m naret was erected of their heads[10] (At Hangu too my troops) cut off a hundred or 200 heads of refractory Afghans. Here also was erected a minaret of heads.[11] The Sanger (fortification of the Kivi tribe), was taken. A general massacre ensued. A pile of heads was formed in the Bannu conntry.[12] Such persons (of my army) as had not repaired to their posts had their noses slit.[13] The enemy troops provoked us to fight...A minaret of skulls was erected of these Afghans.[14] The expedition of Bajour being thus terminated to my entire satisfaction...I gave orders for the erection of a pillar of skulls on a rising ground.[15] I sent the army under the command of Hindu Beg to plunder Panjkora. Before they reached Panjkora the inhabitants had fled.[16] The inhabitants of

Memoirs of Zehiruddin Muhammad Babur, translated by John Leyden and William Erskine and annotated and revised by Sir Lucas King, two vols., Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921.

8. P. 118, Vol. 1. 9. P. 256. 10. P.257.
11. P. 258. 12. P. 259. 13. Vol. II, P. 38.
14. P. 83. 15. P. 85. 16. P. 149.

Syedpur who resisted were put to the sword, their women and children were carried into captivity, and all their property plundered.[17] Ibrahim Lodi's Afghan generals were repulsed and Lahore bazar and town were looted and burned.[18] When I first arrived in Agra there was a strong mutual dislike and hostility between my people and the men of the place. The peasantry and soldiers of the country avoided and fled from my men. Afterwards everywhere except only in Delhi and Agra the inhabitants refused to submit or obey.[19] When I came to Agra, it was the hot season. All the inhabitants had fled from terror... The villagers, out of hostility and hatred to us, had taken to rebellion, thieving and robbery. The roads became impassable.[20] Kasimi who had proceeded at this time with a light force towards Bayana had cut off and brought away several heads.[21] Mulla Turk Ali was instructed to see that everything possible was done to plunder and ruin Mewat. Similar orders were given to Maghfur Diwan to proceed to ravage and desolate some of the bordering and remoter districts, ruining the country and carrying off the inhabitants into captivity."

Coming down the line we find that Akbar's father Humayun was perhaps even more cruel and degenerate than Babur because while Babur had to sweat and toil and shed his own blood for plunder and ravage, his son Humayun was heir to a vast kingdom, and unearned riches.

Vincent Smith observes[22]: "Humayun was a

17. P. 151. 18. P. 246. 19. P. 247.
20. P. 274. 21. P. 279.
22. P. 9, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

slave to the opium habit." Humayun was also a highwayman and extortionist. Vincent Smith quotes[23] Humayun's faithful servant Jauhar to say that when Akbar was born "The discrowned king being in extreme poverty, was puzzled how to celebrate (the occasion). The king then ordered (Jauhar to bring the articles given in trust to him); on which I (Jauhar) went and brought 200 Shahrukhis (silver coins), a silver bracelet, and a pod of musk. The two former he ordered me to give back to the owners from whom they had been taken..." This proves that sometime before the birth of prince Akbar his father Humayun had committed a dacoity and robbed somebody of at least 200 silver coins and a silver bracelet. Happy that he had got a son and fearing that his robbery may entail a curse on the infant, Humayun ordered the robbed articles to be restored to their owners.

As was common among Muslim rulers in India Humayun was engaged in deadly combat with his own brothers to grab his deceased father's throne. After repeated battles when Humayun captured his elder brother Kamran he subjected the latter to brutal torture. Vincent Smith says:[24] "Kamran... pressed so hard...had been obliged to disguise himself as a woman (but was captured and) surrendered to Humayun. Humayun decided that it would suffice to blind him. The best and most detailed account is left by Jauhar. His narrative leaves the impression that Humayun felt little

23. P. 11 of Vincent Smith's book, ibid.
24. P. 19, ibid.

concern for his brother's sufferings...One of the men was sitting on (Kamran's) knees. (He) was pulled out of the tent and a lancet was thrust into his eyes...Some (lemon) juice and salt was put into his eyes...After some time he was put on horseback...[25] His family was not molested by Humayun."

One may well imagine the cruelty and torture that Humayun was capable of inflicting on others when he subjected his own brother to such torture. And the reference to the small mercy that he did not molest his brother's wives shows that Humayun used to molest all women he could lay his hands on throughout his life.

And who knows whether he actually desisted from molesting his brother's wives when he did not spare his brother. The assertion may be mere flattery.

Emperor Babur himself appraising his eldest son Humayun (the father of Akbar, as a potential murderer of his brothers) beseeched[26] him on June 27, 1529, not to murder his brothers if he became king. Young Humayun's going berserk helped by immense wealth and a phalanx of hoodlums is testified to by Babur himself in his Memoirs. Babur says[27] "Humayun had repaired to Delhi and there opened several of the houses which contained treasure, and taken possession by force of the

25. P. 20 ibid.

26. P. 231, Crescent in India, by S.R. Sharma, Hind Kitabs Ltd., Bombay-1, 1966.

27. P. 315, Vol. II, Babur's Memoirs, ibid.

contents. I certainly never expected such conduct from him, and being extremely hurt, I wrote and sent him some letters containing the severest reprehension."

Humayun was so tyrannical and overbearing that he imposed a humiliating rite to be observed by all those over whom he ruled. The chronicler Badayuni notes:[28] "When he (Humayun) arrived at Agra he imposed upon the populace a new self-invented form of salutation, and wished them to kiss the ground (before him)."

Vincent Smith asserts[29] that "Humayun was a slave of the opium habit." Mr. Shelat observes[30] that in Agra "Kamran suddenly took ill and suspected that he had been poisoned by Babur's wives at Humayun's instance...[31] After spending about a year in Badakshan Humayun showed characteristic laxity towards duty and suddenly returned to India without the permission of his father, deserting his post. Displeased at the conduct Babur sent him to his jagir in Sambhal.[32] After the capture of Champaner in Gujerat

28. P. 573, Vol. I, Muntakhabut Tawarikh by Abdul Qadir ibn Muluk Shah alias Al Badayuni, translated from the original Persian and edited by George S.A. Ranking, printed by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Baptist Mission Press, 1898.

29. P. 9, Akbar the Great Mogul, by Vincent A. Smith, 2nd edition, revised Indian reprint 1958, S. Chand & Co., Delhi.

30. P. 32, Akbar, by J.M. Shelat, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, 1964, Bombay.

31. P. 20, ibid

32. P. 24, ibid.

Humayun took to feasting and indolence as he did on numerous occasions."

That Akbar's father Humayun was a lecherous degenerate, a profligate sadist and an incorrigible drunkard, drug-addict and a torturer is apparent from the following extracts from Mr. Shelat's book:[33] "On his return to Agra Humayun took to excessive use of opium. Public business was neglected.[34] When the Moguls entered the fort (Chunar)Rumy Khan inflicted barbarous penalty on the garrison in which Humayun acquiesced. The hands of no less than 300 Afghan artillery men were cut. Rumy Khan was appointed commander but was poisoned by jealous chiefs.[35] In Gaur Humayun unaccountably shut himself up for a considerable time in his harem and abandoned himself to every kind of indulgence and luxury.[36] The reasons for the dissatisfaction amongst the Amirs against Humayun were obvious. By 1538 the character of Humayun, his indolence, his excessive addiction to opium and his slothful ways had become notorious...Finding two of his brothers (Hindal and Kamran) ready to stab him in the back, Humayun decided to cut his way back (from Bengal) to Agra."

Thirty-three year-old Humayun taking 14-year-old Hamida Banu as a wife was a virtual rape of a minor girl. Humayun then was a desperate outlaw and fugitive, expelled from India and living by

33 P. 26, Akbar, ibid.
34 P. 27, Ibid.
35 P. 28, Ibid
36 P. 29, Ibid

dacoity in the sandy wastes of Sind. In these circumstances[37] "Humayun came to see his brother (Hindal). In Hindal's harem Humayun saw Hamida Banu, daughter of Mir Baba Dost who was Hindal's religious guide. Humayun was then 33 while Hamida Banu was hardly 14. Humayun sought her hand. The girl herself was opposed to marrying Humayun. Hindal also opposed the match. At last in September 1541, Humayun married her giving two lacs of rupees in dowry." Obviously Humayun purchased Baba Dost's daughter by threats and bribing him with somebody's stolen money.

Having noted that all of Akbar's ancestors from his father Humayun upward to Chengiz Khan and Tamerlain were the most cruel barbarians, sadists and drink and drug-addicts we shall now see that all his descendants too were equally lecherous, cruel and misbehaved.

It may be argued that Akbar himself was noble by some freak though born in a barbarous lineage, and that he could not help his ancestors being first-rate sadists, nor could he be expected to exert any moderating influence on his ancestors. Even accepting this for argument's sake Akbar's own son Jehangir's cruelty and barbarism were phenomenal. Mr. Shelat says[38] "Salim(later emperor Jehangir) gave himself to excessive use of opium and intoxicants and under their influence he inflicted barbarous punishment. He had his recorder flayed alive in his presence and he ordered the

37. Pp. 36, 37, ibid
38. P. 359 ibid.

castration of a woman servant with whom this recorder had fallen in love."

Had Akbar been great and noble his son Jehangir would not have been keen on murdering him. But Jehangir made several attempts to murder his own father Akbar. Referring to one such Vincent Smith notes[39]: "As early as 1591, when Akbar was suffering for a time from stomach-ache and colic, he expressed suspicion that his eldest son (Jehangir) had poisoned him." This episode speaks as much of Jehangir's villainy as of Akbar's being the most hated person of his times.

Not having succeeded in poisoning his father Akbar Jehangir wanted to capture and kill Akbar. Mr. Smith records[40]: (In view of Jehangir's rebellion) "Akbar returned to Agra probably early in May 1601...[41] (Salim while in rebellion sought the support of the Portuguese and their ammunition against his father)...[42] Abul Fazal was transfixed with a lance and promptly decapitated. His head was sent to Allahabad, where Salim received it with unholy joy and treated it with shameful insult...[43] The elder prince, when safely established with his court at Allahabad, far removed from parental supervision, abandoned himself without restraint to his favourite vices, consuming opium and strong drink to such an extent that his

39. P. 191, Vincent Smith's 'Akbar the Great Mogul', ibid.

40. P. 207, ibid.

41. P. 210, ibid.

42. P. 222, ibid.

43. P. 227, ibid.

naturally fierce temper became ungovernable. The most fearful penalties were inflicted for trivial offences; pardon was never thought of, and his adherents were struck dumb with terror---A news writer convicted of a plot against the prince's life had been flayed alive while Salim calmly watched his long-drawn agony...[44] Salim's conduct at Allahabad had been so cruel and tyrannical and his intemperate habits were so notorious that opposition to his succession would have been justifiable on public grounds...[45] It is certain that Salim (Jehangir) desired his father's demise."

About Jehangir (prince Salim) Dr. Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastav writes:[46] "Since the age of 20 (Jehangir) had been progressively asserting himself ...and later in a kind of veiled insubordination, and subsequently in open revolt...Akbar fell ill (and) in an unconscious state uttered these words:[47] 'Baba Shekhuji (prince Salim alias Jehangir) since all this sultanate will devolve on thee, why hast thou made this attack on me. To take away my life there was no need of injustice. I would have given it to thee if thou hadst asked me.'[48] The same year Salim twice became guilty of explicit disobedience—early in 1598 when Akbar asked him to lead an expedition to Transoxania Salim declined to go. A little later (when) Salim

44. P. 232, ibid.

45. P. 234, ibid.

46. P. 457 "Akbar the Great", Vol. I, Political History, 1542-1605 A.D., by Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastava, Shiv Lal Agarwala & Co. (P) Ltd. Publishers, Agra.

47. Pp. 458, 459, ibid.

48. P. 461, ibid.

was asked to take charge of the royal army in the Deccan he absented himself at the time of departure ..[49] During May 1589 to May 1598 Akbar had become greatly alienated from Salim, and the seed of rebellion was sown in the prince's mind...The older he grew the more fond he became of sexual indulgence, of drink and other youthful follies. Although he had a large harem he had in June 1596 fallen violently in love with Zainkhan Koka's daughter. It may be that the story of the prince's early love for Mihirunnisa (future Nurjahan) and Anarkali were not without substance.[50] When he was sent with the expedition against the Rana of Mewar from self-indulgence, wine-drinking and bad company (Salim) spent much time in Ajmer. Taking advantage of Akbar's absence Salim decided on open rebellion. He marched rapidly from Ajmer towards Agra, confiscating more than a crore worth of cash and effects of Shahbazkhan Kambu.[51] On return to Allahabad Salim had relapsed into his old habit of drink and self-indulgence. Surrounded by unworthy companions he imbibed excessive love of flattery. He had for years been familiar with these vices but now he carried them to excess. He became addicted to wine at all hours to such extent that it ceased to intoxicate him. So he began taking opium in addition to wine. He started drinking at the age of 18 and at this period he took sometimes as many as 20 cups of double distilled spirit. Under the double intoxication of wine and opium he sometimes inflicted

49. P. 462, ibid.
50. P. 46[illegible] ibid.
51. P. 474, ibid.

capital punishment for ordinary offences. One day in a fit of drunkenness he had a news-writer, who seemed to have reported the prince's indulgence in excessive drink, to Akbar, horribly flayed alive in his presence. He castrated a page, and had a domestic servant beaten to death."

Not only Akbar's son Jehangir even Akbar's grandson Shahjahan who happened to be emperor after Jehangir, was a degenerate barbarian like all his ancestors upto Chengiz Khan and Tamerlain and beyond.

Maulvi Moinuddin Ahmad writes[51] "European historians have sometimes charged Shahjahan with bigotry traced to the fountainhead of narrow-mindedness in (his wife) Mumtaz."

E.B. Havell notes[52] "The Jesuits were bitterly persecuted by Shahjahan. Only a short time before her death Mumtaz Mahal, who was a relentless enemy of the Christians, had instigated Shahjahan to attack the Portuguese settlement in Hoogly."

Another historical work records[53] "Many times did Shahjahan invite the monks and secular priests to become Mohommadans (but when they repudiated his overtures) Shahjahan was greatly

51. P.8, The Taj and Its Environments, by Maulvi Moinuddin Ahmad, 2nd edition, printed by R. G. Bansal & Co., 339 Kasairat Bazar, Agra.

52. P. 1041, The 19th Century & After, a Monthly Review edited by James Knowles, Vol. VIII, article titled The Taj & Its Designers, by E. B. Havell.

53. Pp. viii-ix, The Transactions of the Archaeological Society of Arga, Jan. to June 1878.

irritated and there and then ordered the priests to be executed the next day by the torture then used against the worst outlaws, that of being trampled underfoot by elephants."

Keene states[54] "Shahjahan surpassed all the Mogul emperors in autocratic pride and was the first of them to safeguard the throne by murdering all possible rivals....[55] According to Roe who knew Shahjahan personally, his nature was unbending and mingled with extreme pride, and contempt of all."

Shahjahan's own official court chronicle, asserts[56] "It had been brought to the notice of His Majesty that during the late reign many idol temples had been begun, but remained unfinished at Banaras, the great stronghold of infidelity. The infidels were now desirous of completing them. His Majesty, the defender of faith, gave orders that at Banaras and throughout all his dominions in every place, all temples that had been begun should be cast down. It was now reported from the province of Allahabad that 76 temples had been destroyed in the district of Banaras."

In connection with the conquest of Daulatabad it is stated in the same chronicle[57] "Kasim Khan

---

54. P. 38, Keene's Handbook for Visitors to Agra & Its Neighbourhood (Thacker's Handbook of Hindustan rewritten and brought up-to-date by E. A. Duncan).

55. P. 155, ibid.

56. P. 39, The Badshahnama, by Mulla Abdul Hamid Lahori.

57. P. 46 ibid.

and Kambu brought 400 Christian prisoners male and female, young and old, with the idols of their worship to the presence of the faith-defending emperor. He ordered that the principles of the Muhammadan religion be explained to them and they be called upon to adopt it. A few embraced the faith but the majority in perversity and wilfulness rejected the proposal. These were distributed among the amirs who were directed to keep these despicable wretches in rigorous confinement. So it came to pass that many of them passed from prison to hell. Such of their idols as were the likeness of the Prophet's were thrown into the Jumna, the rest were broken to pieces." Like Jehangir's Shahjahan's whole reign is full of the most cruel dealings. Shahjahan's son Aurangzeb who succeeded him as emperor is a byword for extreme fanaticism, cruelty and treachery. Aurangzeb died a bare 261 years ago (in 1707 A.D.). If he could be extremely cruel and barbarous how much more cruel and barbarous would his great grand father Akbar have been! So, no matter how many generations above or below Akbar we probe we find them a long line of barbarians. Akbar was but a link in that chain. He was not the least different from others of his lineage. Had he been noble his descendants at least should have been good, noble, well-behaved and universally loved and respected individuals. This is sheer logic. One who has not read accounts of the reign of Akbar but has heard of the cruelty of his ancestors and descendants would at once see through the bluff of Akbar's nobility.

Before referring to Akbar's own cruelties and

barbarities we shall see what the standard of behaviour of his contemporaries was. Had Akbar, as an emperor wielding supreme power, been great and noble his contemporaries would not have been allowed to commit heinous crimes. In fact they would have been very cultured and well behaved. But in reality they were as cruel as wolves and hyenas.

[58] "The mother of Chungiz Khan, the late regent of Gujerat, at this time (1573) preferred a complaint to Akbar that Joojhar Khan Hubshy had put her son to death."

Abul Mali, a senior courtier[59] "who fled towards Kabul wrote to Mah Ghck (a lady from Akbar's own foster brother's royal family) recalling earlier friendly ties with Humayun (father of Akbar). She welcomed him and gave her daughter Fakhrunnisa in marriage to him. Later finding his mother-in-law an obstacle in his way he himself killed her with a dagger."

[60] Akbar's own uncle Kamran "disgraced himself by inflicting on his opponents the most fiendish tortures, not sparing even women and children."

The instances quoted above should suffice to convince the reader that the whole environment before, after or during Akbar's reign reeked with

58. P. 147. History of the Rise of the Mahommadan Power in India till the year A. D. 1612, translated from the original Persian of Mohammad Kasim Ferishta, by John Briggs, vol. II, published by S. Dey, 59-A Shambazar Street, Calcutta-4 reprinted 1966).

59. P. 88, M.J. Shelat's book, ibid.

60. P. 18. Vincent Smith's book, ibid.

murders, massacres, rape and plunder. Akbar's half-a-century of reign did not make even the slightest difference to the pattern or standards of mediaeval behaviour. Had Akbar been great and noble posterity would have noticed a distinct change in life before Akbar, and that during or after his reign. Since even his great grandson Aurangzeb was the very embodiment of cruelty sheer logic should tell us that Akbar far from being virtuous must have been a deeply hated person worthy to be the great grandfather of Aurangzeb and even more barbarous than the latter because Akbar was Aurangzeb's senior by 100 years in an age when cruelty and brutality lost their rigour and edge steadily over a very long period.

In the next chapter we shall narrate Akbar's own and his generals, and other officials' cruelties, and thereby prove that the conclusions we reach by logic and worldly wisdom are fully borne out by history. Absurd and illogical dogmas like Akbar's fancied nobility have been embedded in Indian history because history writers and teachers have been assiduously trained to avoid making use of logic and the law of evidence from considerations of political expediency in a milenium of alien rule. Through long habit the legal and logical faculties of scholars of Indian history, of the traditional school, have fallen into such disuse that they express surprise if told that logic and the law of evidence must be used as supreme touchstones to test the veracity of dogmas or even documents, records, chronicles, inscriptions and archaeological finds.

AKBAR'S BARBARITIES

In no way was Akbar less cruel than any of his ancestors, descendants or contemporaries. If anything his crafty, scheming and treacherous nature and the unlimited power that he wielded over a vast region qualifies him to be considered one of the foremost tyrants and sadists in world history, leave aside India's alone.

Col. Tod asserts[1] "Generations of martial races (The Rajputs or Kshatriyas) were cut off by his sword, and lustres rolled away ere his conquests were sufficiently confirmed. He was long ranked with Shahbuddin, Alla (Allauddin) and other instruments of destruction, and with every just claim; and like these he constructed a Mumbar (pulpit or platform of Islamite preachers) for the Koran from the altars of Eklingaji (the deity of the Rajput warriors)."

Communalists or those seeking academic or other patronage under alien regimes in India have tended to mention Akbar, in and out of context, as comparable in nobility of character and greatness of heart with the ancient Indian king Ashok. Debunking this view Vincent Smith justifiably

1. P. 259, Vol. 1, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, by Lt. Col. James Tod, in two volumes, reprinted 1957, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., Broadway House, 68-74 Carter Lane, London, E-C.-4.

observes[2] "Akbar would have laughed at the remorse felt by Ashok for the miseries caused by the conquest of Kalinga, and would have utterly condemned his great predecessor's decision to abstain from all further wars of aggression."

How the whole of Akbar's life was one sickening tale of cruelty, torture inflicted on those whom he disliked, and treachery, may be noted from the following extracts from accounts written by a number of scholars.

Vincent Smith says[3]: "Kamran's only son (who was Akbar's cousin) was privately executed at Gwalior in 1565—by the order of Akbar, who thus set an evil example, imitated on a large scale by his descendants Shahjahan and Aurangzeb."

The above observation makes it clear that the consummate villainy of emperor Shahjahan (Akbar's grandson) and of emperor Aurangzeb (Akbar's great grandson) were not their original traits but a precious heritage handed down by Akbar.

Sadism was a prominent, permanent and consistent trait of Akbar's mental makeup. It manifested itself throughout his life from early childhood to his very last moments.

On November 5, 1556 when Akbar was a mere stripling of less than 14 years of age he slashed the neck of his Hindu adversary, Hemu, brought before him unconscious and bleeding. Vincent Smith describing this incident after the

2. Pp. 50-51, Akbar The Great Mogul, by Vincent Smith, ibid.

3. P. 20, ibid.

fateful battle of Panipat which won the crown of India for Akbar, says[4] "Probably Hemu would have won but for the accident that he was struck in the eye by an arrow which pierced his brain and rendered him unconscious. His army scattered and made no further resistance. Hemu's elephant which fled into the jungle was brought back and its occupant was placed before Behram Khan and Akbar. Akbar smote Hemu on the neck with his scimitar. The bystanders also plunged their swords into the bleeding corpse. Hemu's head was sent to Kabul to be exposed and his trunk was gibbeted at one of the gates of Delhi. The official story, that a magnanimous sentiment of unwillingness to strike a helpless prisoner already half-dead compelled Akbar to refuse to obey his guardian (Behram Khan's instructions to strike a semi-conscious enemy), seems to be the late invention of courtly flatterers." This last observation of Smith underlining how flatterers have from time to time falsified history by varnishing their patrons' beastly deeds, needs to be carefully noted by all students of mediaeval Muslim chronicles.

Akbar's victorious forces pushing south from Panipat after that great victory[5] "marched straight to Delhi, which opened its gates to Akbar, who made his entry in state. Agra also passed into his possession. In accordance with the ghastly custom of the times, a tower was built with the heads of the slain. Immense treasures were taken with the family of Hemu whose aged father was executed."

4. P. 29, Vincent Smith's book, ibid.
5. P. 29, ibid.

After defeating Baz Bahadur the sultan of Malwa, at Sangrur near Dewas in Central India, Akbar's generals Adham Khan and Peer Mohammad[6] "disgraced themselves and their sovereign (Akbar) by disgusting cruelties, of which Badayuni was a horrified witness. They had the captives brought before them and troop after troop of them put to death, so that their blood flowed river upon river. Peer Mohammad cracked brutal jests, and when remonstrance was offered replied 'in one single night all these captives have been taken, what can be done with them.' Even Sayyids and learned Sheikhs who came out to meet him with Korans in their hands were slain and burnt."

After the battle Adham Khan who was for a time appointed governor of Malwa was recalled and Peer Mohammad was appointed in his place.[7] "In conferring such an important trust on a man so unworthy Akbar committed a grievous error. Peer Mohammad attacked Burhanpur and Bijagadh, perpetrating a general massacre at the latter fortress. As Badayuni observes, he practised to the utmost the code of Chengiz Khan, massacring or enslaving all the inhabitants of Burhanpur and Asirgadh, and destroying many towns and villages to the south of the Narmada (river)."

Adham Khan was later ordered to be thrown over the parapet of Agra fort and dashed to pieces for murdering a courtier called Atga Khan. Referring to this Smith says[8] "Adham Khan was thrown

6. P. 37, Vincent Smith's book, ibid.
7. P. 40, ibid.
8. P. 43, ibid.

headlong from the terrace. Being only half killed Akbar compelled (his men) to drag him up again, and throw him down a second time. His neck was broken and his brains dashed out." The horrid scene of Adham Khan's brain being dashed out is realistically reproduced in one of the Akbarnama pictures exhibited at South Kensington."

When Akbar himself led an attack against the people of eight villages in Etah district (Sakit pargana)[9] "in Paronkh village a house was set on fire, and about a thousand rebels consumed."

[10]"An extraordinary incident which occurred in April, (1567) while the royal camp was at Thaneshwar the famous Hindu place of pilgrimage, to the north of Delhi, throws a rather unpleasant light upon Akbar's character. The sanyasis who assembled at the holy tank were divided into two parties, which Abul Fazal calls Kurs and Puris. The leader of the latter complained to the king that the Kurs had unjustly occupied the accustomed sitting place of the Puris, who were thus debarred from collecting the pilgrims' alms. (They were granted permission to decide the issue by mortal combat). The fight began with swords. (Later) swords were discarded for bows and arrows, and these again for stones. Akbar seeing that the Puris were outnumbered gave the signal to some of his more savage followers to help the weaker party. The reinforcements enabled the Puris to drive the Kurs into headlong flight. The vanquished were pursued and a number of 'the wretches were sent to annihilation!. The chronicler

9. P. 39 ibid. 10. Pp. 56-57, ibid.

meticulously adds that (Akbar) was highly delighted with this sport. The other historians tell us that the numbers originally engaged were two or three hundred on one side and 500 on the other, so that with the reinforcements the total came to about a 1,000. The author of the Tabaqat agrees with Abul Fazal that 'the emperor greatly enjoyed the sight'. It is disappointing to find that a man like Akbar could encourage such sanguinary sport."

This incident throws a lurid light on Akbar's tastes and motives. As a fanatic Muslim it gave him great pleasure to see that two factions of the hated Hindus slaughtered one another. That he derived immense pleasure from two groups of men stabbing and stoning one another only speaks for Akbar's very sadist mind.

That people of his time used to regard Akbar's approach with the same terror as that of a man-eater on the prowl, is clear from the two crowded Hindu pilgrim centres, Banaras and Prayag (Allahabad) getting deserted on Akbar's visit there. Vincent Smith says[11] "Akbar then marched to Prayag and Banaras, which were plundered because the people were rash enough to close their gates." Obviously, people who are generally eager to see royalty and pay homage would not have barricaded doors or run away after locking their homes unless they panicked from the rape and rapine that Akbar's phalanx of hoodlums spread in its wake wherever they went for half a century, in India.

11. P. 58, ibid.

[12]"One man, Mohammad Mirak of Mashhad, a special confidant of Khan Zaman (who had revolted against Akbar) was tortured for five successive days on the execution ground. Each day he was trussed up in a wooden frame and placed before one of the elephants. The elephant caught him in his trunk and squeezed him and flung him from one side to the other. As a clear sign for his execution was not given the elephant played with him. Abul Fazal relates this horrid barbarity without a word of censure."

The terrible mass immolation by fire preferred by Rajput women and infants to escape rape, humiliation and molestation by Akbar's army men after the capture of Chittor fort, testifies to the brutality that was practised during Akbar's reign. Vincent Smith observes[13] "The Jauhar sacrifice completed before the final capture was on a large scale. The fires were kindled in three distinct places. Nine queens, five princesses, their daughters as well as two infant sons, and all the chieftains' families who happened not to be away on their estates perished either in the flames or in the assault. During the course of the following morning when Akbar made his entry 8,000 Rajputs vowed to death sold their lives as dearly as possible and perished to a man. Akbar exasperated by the obstinate resistance offered to his arms treated the garrison and town with merciless severity. The 8,000 strong Rajput garrison having been zealously helped during the siege by 40,000 peasants, the emperor

12. P. 58. ibid.
13. P. 64, ibid.

ordered a general massacre, which resulted in the death of 30,000. Many were made prisoners."

[14]"In November 1572 when Akbar approached Ahmedabad the fugitive king, Muzaffar Shah was found hiding in a cornfield and brought in. Certain camp followers having insolently plundered his effects, Akbar set an example of stern justice by ordering the offenders to be trampled to death by elephants."

An insight into the working of Akbar's illiterate mind is offered by the punishment he meted out to a senior courtier called Ham-zaban. This courtier had been in revolt at Surat in Gujerat province. He was captured on February 26, 1573. Since the word Ham-zaban signifies 'one true to his tongue (word)'[15] "he was barbarously punished by the excision of his tongue."

In 1573 A.D [16]"Husain Kuli Khan (Khan Jahan) waited on Akbar with his prisoners. The eyes of Masud Husain Mirza had been sewn up .. The other 300 prisoners were drawn up before Akbar with the skins of asses, hogs and dogs drawn over their faces. Some of them were executed with various ingenous tortures......It is disgusting to find a man like Akbar sanctioning such barbarities ..which he inherited from his Tatar ancestors. The severities practised did not finally extirpate the Mirza trouble, which soon broke out again in Gujerat".

[17]"The battle of Ahmedabad was fought on

14. P. 79, ibid. 15. P. 81, ibid.
16. P. 82, ibid. 17. P. 86, ibid.

September 2, 1573. In accordance with the gruesome custom of the times, a pyramid was built with the heads of the rebels, more than 2,000 in number".

[18]"The heads of the Afghan leaders killed were thrown into a boat and forwarded to Daud (the Afghan ruler of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa)" to warn him of the fate which awaited him……[19]On March 3, 1575 the battle decisive was fought with Daud's forces at Tukaroi....Munim Khan following the barbarous fashion of the times massacred his prisoners, whose heads were sufficiently numerous to furnish eight sky-high minarets."

[20]Another battle against Daud was fought on Thursday, July 12 near Rajmahal. Daud, a prisoner "overcome with thirst asked for water. They filled his slipper with water and brought it to him---To behead him they took two chops at his neck without success...They stuffed his head with straw and anointed it with perfumes, and gave it in charge to Sayid Khan...The latter met Akbar at village Birar and cast down Daud's head in the courtyard. Daud's headless trunk was gibbeted at Tanda."

[21]In or about 1603 A. D. Akbar, who was used to retire to his room in the afternoon for rest.......happened to emerge earlier than was expected and at first could not find any of his servants....When he came near the throne and couch he saw a hapless lamplighter coiled up like a snake, in a careless death-like sleep close to the

18. P. 91, ibid. 19. P. 92, ibid.
20. P. 104, ibid. 21. P. 117, ibid.

royal couch. Enraged at the sight he ordered him to be thrown from the tower, and he was dashed into a thousand pieces"

[22]"Sheikh Abdun Nabi the late Sadar and his opponent Makhdumul Mulk were sent into exile under the pretext of pilgrimage to Mecca. Both were allowed to return. Makhdumul Mulk died at Ahmedabad in 1582 leaving great riches and valuable books, which were all confiscated. His sons several times suffered torture and were reduced to abject poverty. Two years later Abdun Nabi was murdered presumably in pursuance of secret orders from the emperor".

[23]"Special cases of severity to individuals (in Bihar and Bengal) increased the ill-feeling, and it is said that the officials added fuel to the fire by their greed for money".

[24]"Akbar never felt any scruple about ordering the private, informal execution or assassination of opponents who could not be executed publicly".

[25]"Notwithstanding the fine phrases about general tolerance which occupy so large a space in the writings of Abul Fazl and the sayings of Akbar, many acts of fierce intolerance were committed..... In the years 1581-82 a large number of Sheikhs and fakirs, apparently those who resisted innovation, were exiled, mostly to Kandahar, and exchanged for horses, presumably being enslaved".

A young handsome Hindu painter named Yashwant (mis-spelled by Muslim chroniclers as

22. P. 130, ibid. 23. P. 132, ibid.
24. P. 135, ibid. 25. P. 159, ibid.

Deshwandh) stabbed himself to death, from melancholia because of the foul atmosphere in Akbar's court reeking with sodomy, doping, drugging, drinking and prostitution.

Raja Bhagwandas, one of Akbar's most senior courtiers, brother-in-law, and general also stabbed himself in disgust because he found life in Akbar's court intolerable, humiliating, degrading and vicious. The official explanation is that he and Daswandh stabbed themselves in fits of insanity. All such acts in protest against the regime in power are always dubbed 'insane.' Historians must not, therefore, take such official versions at their face value.

Vincent Smith says[26] "Wheeler asserts that Akbar kept a poisoner in pay" whose duty it was to poison people at Akbar's orders...The sentences on convicts were of the appalling kind. The modes of execution included...impalement, trampling by elephants, crucifixion, beheading, hanging and others. Babur had ordered (flaying) without scruple. As minor penalties mutilation and whipping of great severity were commonly ordered. No records of proceedings civil or criminal were kept. Persons acting as judges thought fit to follow Koranic rules. Akbar encouraged trial by ordeal. The horrors of an execution ground are realistically depicted in one of the contemporary illustrations to the Akbarnama at South Kensington".

[27] "(Akbar) showed severity in his treatment of the garrison of Chittor and in the tortures inflicted on the followers of the Mirzas." Though

26. P. 250, ibi[d.]   27. P. 251, ibid.

Vincent Smith mentions but two episodes in which Akbar acted with great tyranny and cruelty yet every campaign of Akbar whether against a political rival or a rebel was attended by brutal severity, and there is no reason why any one should be singled out. Smith adds[27] "It is probable that his (Akbar's) clemency, when shown, often was dictated by policy rather then by sentiment."

Smith says[28]: "He (Akbar) was truly as the Jesuit author calls him 'the terror of the East,' and he had been spoiled to a certain extent by more than four decades of autocracy. It is possible he was feared rather than loved. The dread of him even at an earlier time was so potent that he felt himself free to flout and insult the most sacred feelings of his subjects. At the end of 1581 his personal ascendancy was established so firmly that he could venture to do what he pleased. He used the liberty to do some outrageous things."

[29]"The horrid punishment of mutilation which is prescribed by the Koran, was used freely. Neither Akbar nor Abul Fazal had any regard for the judicial formalities of oaths and witnesses. The Faujdar was expected to reduce rebels, always numerous and whenever necessary to use his troops against recalcitrant villagers in order to enforce payment of government dues."

Col. Tod mentions a peculiar instance of Akbar's despotism and illiterate coercion. He

27. P. 251, ibid.
28. P. 256, ibid.
29. P. 276, ibid.

states[30] "On Jodhabai's death Akbar commanded everybody to shave off his head and beard in mourning. To secure compliance, the royal barbers had the execution of the mandate. But when they came to the quarters of the Hadas, in order to remove these tokens of manhood, they were repulsed with buffets and contumely. The enemies of Rao Bhoj (who was one of Akbar's generals and a son of Rao Surjan the ex-chief of Ranthambhor fort region) aggravated this crime of resistance and insinuated to the royal ear that the outrage upon the barbers was accompanied with expressions insulting to the memory of the departed princess. Akbar forgetting his vassal's gallant services commanded that Rao Bhoj should be pinioned and forcibly deprived of his Mooch (moustache). The Hadas flew to their arms. The camp was thrown into tumult, and would soon have presented a wild scene of bloodshed had not the emperor, seasonably repenting of his folly, repaired to the Boondi quarters in person."

The Rajputs as a community did not have any respect left for such of their women who had to spend their lives as detenues in Muslim harems. The Hadas, therefore, deeply resented having to shave off their beards and moustache, which were their cherished symbols of manly valour, for a woman who had fallen from grace and accepted the status of a Muslim whore instead of being married in the traditional holy style and custom to a

30. P. 385, Vol. II, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, by Lt. Col. James Tod, ibid.

brave Rajput. Akbar's order was, therefore, particularly galling to the proud Rajputs. The wily and shrewd Akbar himself not wanting to lose even one opportunity of humiliating the pride of the Rajputs used this occasion to force those, who were subservient to him, to shed their beards and moustache and shave off their heads The Rajputs who as orthodox Hindus would otherwise have willingly shaven off, considered it particularly humiliating to shed their hair in homage to one who had let their proud tradition down.

Killing and massacring others was regarded as a pastime and diversion by a bereaved Akbar. Could there exist a more sinister kind of sadism ! The chronicler Ferishta notes[31]: "Prince Murad Mirza falling dangerously ill (May 1599) was buried at Shapoor. The corpse was afterwards removed to Agra, and laid by the side of Humayun, the prince's grandfather. The king's grief for the death of his son increased his desire for conquering the Deccan, as a means of diverting his mind."

An account of the horrid cruelties that Akbar perpetrated on the defenders of Chittor fort is

31. P. 171, Vol. II, History of the Mahomedan Power in India, till the year A.D. 1612, Translated from the original Persian of Mahomed Kasim Ferishta by John Briggs, in four volumes. Published by S. Dey, 59-A Shambazar Street, Calcutta-4.

Incidentally this points to the possibility of Humayun's grave in Delhi being a fake. We have already proved in our book titled "Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research" that what is pointed out as the mausoleum of Humayun, in Delhi, is an ancient Hindu palace.

found[32] on pages 105-109 of Mr. Shelat's book. He says "Akbar entered Chittor on February 24, 1568. He issued an order of general massacre. Throughout that day the invaders roamed in the streets killing and destroying...The number killed was so vast that their sacred threads alone weighed 74½ maunds of eight seers each." A wounded Patta lying near the Govindshyam alias Kumbhashyam temple was trampled to death by Akbar's own elephant. "Apart from 8,000 fighting Rajputs, there were inside the fort about 40,000 peasants watching and serving. The order for general massacre was not withdrawn until about 30,000 of them were put to death, though the struggle was over. Neither the temples nor the towers escaped the vandalism of the invaders. When everything was over Akbar started on February 28, 1568 on a pilgrimage to Ajmer." This is like the proverbial robber Telling the rosary after the robbery.

[33]Husain Quli Khan came with 300 prisoners captured during his battle with Ibrahim Mirza in the Punjab. Among them was Masud Husain Mirza whose eyes were sewed up while the rest were brought in cow skins from which (even) the horns had not been taken away. A few of these prisoners were ordered to be released but the rest were put to death by various ingenious tortures. That very day Said Khan arrived from Multan and presented Ibrahim's head. The punishments meted out to the rebels were barbaric and cruel.

32. "Akbar" by J.M. Shelat, published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chowpaty, Bombay, 1964.
33. Pp. 129-136, ibid.

[34]In the campaign against the rebels in Gujerat "the heads of Mohammad Husain and Ikhtiyar were sent to be hung and displayed on the gates of Agra and Fatehpur. Following the custom of the Timurids, Akbar had a pyramid made of the heads of the rebels who had perished that day."

[35]"It would not be unreasonable to think that the two Rajput generals (Bhagwandas and Man-Singh deputed by Akbar to assist Shahbaz Khan against Rana Pratap) were abruptly dismissed by him because they showed their opposition to the methods of barbarity and brutality Shahbaz proposed to use to achieve his object of capturing the Sisodia hero."

The weird fear that Akbar inspired in all those subservient to him is well illustrated by the incident narrated by Badayuni. He says[36] "When at the very time of the accession, Abul Mali fled from Lahore, Pehlwan Gul Guz, his keeper, committed suicide through fear of the emperor's anger."

[37]"When the second day after the victory, the emperor came to Panipat, he had a minaret built of the heads of the slain."

34. P. 141, ibid.
35. P. 177, ibid.

36. P. 4, Vol. II, Muntakhabut Tawarikh, by Abul Qadir Ibn Muluk Shah alias Al Badayuni, translated from the original Persian and edited by George S.A. Ranking, printed for the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, 1898.

37. P. 10, ibid.

Describing the defeat of Baz Bahadur, ruler of Malwa by Adham Khan and Peer Mohammad Khan (Akbar's two generals), Badayuni says[38]: "Baz Bahadur's retinue and servants and wives were all taken prisoner. On the day of the victory the two captains (Adham Khan and Peer Mohammad) remained on the spot, and had the captives brought before them, and troop after troop of them put to death, so that their blood flowed river upon river and Peer Mohammad with a smile on his face said in jest 'what a plague of a strong neck this victim has and a river of blood has flowed from it.' (When I conveyed to him my abhorrance) Peer Mohammad replied 'In one single night all these captives have been taken, what is to be done with them? And the same night these plundering marauders having stowed away their Mohammadan captives, consisting of the wives of Shaikhs and Sayyids, and learned men, and nobles, in their boxes and saddle-bags brought them to Ujjain. And the Sayyids and Sheikhs of that place came out to meet him with their Qurans in their hands, but Peer Mohammad put them all to death and burnt them. Adham Khan sent the whole account of the victory to the court."

[39]"In those days Peer Mohammad, who, after Adham Khan went to court, possessed absolute power in Malwa collected a great force and led it against Burhanpur and reduced Beejagadh and made a general slaughter. Then he turned towards

38. Pp. 42, 43, ibid.
39. P. 46, ibid.

Khandesh and was not content unless he practised to the utmost the code of Chengiz Khan massacring and making prisoners of all the inhabitants of Burhanpur and Asheergadh and then crossing the river Narmada he raised the conflict to the very heavens and utterly destroyed many towns and villages and swept everything clean and clear."

Akbar's maternal uncle Khwaja Muazzam having murdered his own wife Akbar [40]"first had him mauled with kicks and sticks, and then gave him several duckings, and packed him off to Gwalior (where he died)."

[41] In the year 971 A. H. "the emperor had Mirza Muqim of Isfahan together with Meer Yaqub of Kashmir put to death on the charge of being Shias. The two (had) brought to court the daughter of Husain Khan as a sort of present." This is an instance of Akbar's lechery, with which we shall deal later in an independent chapter.

[42] "Husain Quli Khan came from the Punjab and brought with him Masud Husain Mirza with his eyes blindfolded and a number of other prisoners of the followers of the Mirza to Fathpur. They numbered nearly 300 and he brought them prisoners before the emperor with the skins of asses, hogs and dogs drawn over their faces. Some of them were put to death by various ingenious tortures... Said Khan came from Multan to pay homage to the emperor, and brought with him the head of

40. P. 71, ibid.
41. P. 128, ibid. 42. P. 163, ibid.

Mirza Ibrahim Husain which he had dissevered from his body after his death. This became the foundation of his favour as a courtier." This shows how gratified Akbar used to be whenever a severed head was presented to him.

In A. H. 980 when the town and temple of Nagarkot were savagely attacked and captured by Akbar's army, his soldiers[43] "through their zeal and excessive hatred of idolatry filled their shoes with the blood (of slaughtered cows and men) and splashed it on the doors and walls of the temple."

Akbar's subtle way of murdering in cold blood unwanted people is illustrated by the end of Mir Muizzul Mulk and Mulla Mohammad Yazdi. These two arrived at Firozabad.[44] "The emperor sent word that they be separated from their guards, put into a boat and taken by way of the Jamna to Gwalior. Afterwards he sent another order that they be done away with. So they put them in a boat and when they were in deep water, ordered the sailors to swamp the boat...After some days Qazi Yakub came from Bengal and the emperor sent him to follow the other two...And one by one he sent all the Mullas against whom he had any suspicion to annihilation...Haji Ibrahim was sent to Ranthambhor. There he died. They found his body (strangled) with long strips of cloth."

To satiate his idle illiterate curiosity Akbar once ruined the lives of several infants purchased and wrested away like chattel from their indigent and

43. P. 165, ibid.
44. P. 285, ibid.

suckling mothers. It need not be stressed that they could all be only Hindus. One may well imagine the heart-wrench this demonaic act must have caused to those unfortunate mothers. The chronicler Badayuni states : [45] "At this time (about the year 987 A. H.) they brought a man to court who had no ears nor any trace of the orifices of the ear. In spite of this he heard everything that was said. In order to verify the circumstances of this case an order was issued that several suckling infants should be kept in a secluded place far from habitations, where they should not hear a word spoken. Well-disciplined nurses were to be placed over them who were to refrain from giving them any instruction in speaking. To carry out this order about twenty sucklings were taken from their mothers, for a consideration in money, and were placed in an empty house which got the name of "Dumb House". After three or four years they all turned out dumb, "since they were brought up in a world of silence where no human voice was allowed to fall on their ears". Many of them soon died, adds Badayuni. Akbar should take the cake for inventing this rare piece of cruelty which perhaps no other monarch in the world may have ever thought of or could have executed with such immaculate and ruthless efficiency.

[46] "Sheikh Qutubuddin of Jalesar was sent into exile to Bhakkar (in Sind) together with other faqirs. There he died," obviously from thirst and hunger, being left high and dry in a sandy desert.

45. P. 296, ibid. 46. P. 308, ibid.

[47] "A large number of Sheikhs and faqirs were sent to other places, mostly to Qandahar, where they were exchanged for horses." Obviously Akbar rated mules, horses and asses more than men and had no qualms in bartering away the men he disliked in exchange for beasts of burden.

The Islamic fanaticism of Akbar, who is generally flaunted as a man who rated all religions or sects equal, is illustrated by another similar exchange. [48] "About this time the emperor captured a sect of Sheikhs known as Ilahis. They had invented names similar to those of the laws and religious commands and the fast of Islam. His Majesty asked them whether they repented of their vanity. At his command they were sent to Bhakkar and Qandahar and were given to merchants to exchange for Turkish colts." These instances show that Akbar used the towns and markets of Bhakkar and Qandahar as 'clearing houses' for unwanted people by selling them as slaves.

[49] "Sheikh Husain, grandson of Khwaja Muinuddin he banished to Bhakkar because when he returned from Mecca he didn't do obeisance to the emperor in the prescribed manner....The grandsons of Sheikh Adhan who were some of the great Sheikhs of Jaunpur, with their wives and families he sent to Ajmer and gave them a fixed provision. (Some) of them died and some were living in poverty." The words "fixed provision" are

47. P. 308, ibid.
48. P. 308, ibid.
49. P. 309, ibid.

obviously a euphemism for starving these people. These examples show that Akbar could do just what he liked with all his subjects. He could torture them, sell them, molest their wives, banish them or starve them.

Akbar had no scruples in turning over a man to a mob of hooligans to be killed. He used this method to bring about the death of Sheikh Abdun Nabi. Badayuni the chronicler says[50] "The Sheikh came to Fathpur (in the year 992 A. H.) and made use of some rude language. The emperor unable to restrain his passion struck him in the face. Then (on the plea that he had not returned the sum of Rs. 7,000 loaned to him for the pilgrimage to Mecca) he was handed over as a prisoner to Raja Todarmal and for some time like a defaulting tax-gatherer, they imprisoned him in the counting house of the office, and one night a mob strangled him."

[51] A courtier Haji Ibrahim of Sirhind was similarly stripped of all power and wealth and sent to Ranthambhor fort, obviously to be tortured to death.

Akbar banished Qazi Jalal Multani to the Deccan [52] thinking "it likely that the rulers of that part would put the Qazi to death with various tortures" but his wishful thinking was not fulfilled because the Deccani Muslim rulers are stated to have rewarded him. Perhaps they were happy to shelter Muslims hostile to Akbar whom they hated.

50. P. 321, ibid. 51. P. 327 Ibid 52. P. 323, ibid.

We shall see in a later chapter that Akbar's much vaunted 'marriages said to have been contracted for communal integration and harmony were nothing but outrageous kidnappings brought about with the force of arms. The most publicized among these pseudo-marriages was the one in which Akbar lifted Bharmal's daughter with the force of his ferocious army. That on this occasion he was not proceeding as a happy, loving, smiling bridegroom should but like a lecherous, frowning woman-lifter is proved by a footnote[53] in Dr. Ashirbadilal Shrivastava's book, saying "The marriage did not take place at Deosa as Vincent Smith asserts. People of Deosa and other places on Akbar's route fled away on his approach."

Akbar's cruelty towards the Hindu women kidnapped and shut up in his harem may be judged by the fact that the daughter of Raja Bharmal of Amber (Jaipur) was allowed by him only once, as a small mercy, to visit her father's house. Dr. Shrivastava observes : [54] "The emperor's Hindu queen, the Amber princess, was permitted to pay a visit to her parents at Amber so as to be present at the mourning ceremony for her brother Bhupat. This was unusual courtesy." That means that the women in Akbar's harem were treated as though they were life-convicts kept in close confinement, virtually forever forbidden from visiting anybody

53. P. 63, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, by Dr. Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastava, Shive Lal Agarwal & Co. (P) Ltd. publishers.

54. P. 143, ibid.

in the outside world including their parental home and near relations.

Akbar, a fanatic Muslim and a great Hindu-hater, used to usurp Hindu houses and mansions and make them over to Christians. Testifying to this Dr. Shrivastava says [55] "A notable Hindu family claimed a few houses that had been given to the (Jesuit) fathers to provide accommodation to married Christian converts. Xavier succeeded in getting Akbar's orders from Agra and the houses remained in the possession of the Lahore mission. The hostile Hindu family suffered from vicissitudes to the great satisfaction of Pinheiro." A footnote on page 406 of Dr. Shrivastava's book records : "Pinheiro and his colleagues in the church were accused of eating human flesh, of kidnapping children, and of killing young men. An attempt was also made to poison the fathers through the collussion of a domestic servant. On the X'mas day of 1600 Pinheiro was able to report the baptism of 39 people. One of the men converted was Polada (may be Prahlad), a physician belonging to a respectable Brahmin family."

A person's nature can often be sized up by his tastes. Akbar derived immense pleasure and relaxation in gory fights between men and beasts. Monserrate [56] narrates how when Akbar invited the Jesuit fathers to see a gladiatorial contest, they replied that they could not comply as it was absolu-

55. P. 407, ibid.

56. P. 61, Father Monserrate's "Commentary," ibid.

tely contrary to the Christian discipline and moral standard to organize, or even to look on at human carnage.

Akbar's interference on some occasions in the rite of Sati, preventing Hindu widows from burning themselves on the pyre of their dead husbands is produced as evidence of Akbar's so-called progressive views in wanting to abolish that custom. This is a misrepresentation. Akbar interfered only when he wanted to drag the unhappy women to his own harem. Far from wanting to abolish the Sati custom Akbar treated it as a gala spectacle at which he invited foreigners for a grand ringside view from the royal balcony. Monserrate records that [57]"The king ordered the priests to be summoned to see an instance of this (custom of Sati). They went in ignorance of what was to take place but when they found out, they plainly indicated by their saddened faces how cruel and savage they felt that crime to be. Finally Rudolf publicly reprimanded the King for showing openly by his presence there that he approved of such a revolting crime, and for supporting it by his weighty judgment and explicit approbation." This is emphatic evidence that far from wanting to stop Sati Akbar treated it as considerable fun.

Once an officer commanded by Akbar to find out a suitable place where the Indus could be forded returned saying there was no suitable spot. [58]"The king asked him if he had gone to the place indicated. When he learnt he had not gone that far, the king ordered him to be seized, dragged to the

57. Pp. 61, 62, ibid. 58. P. 83, ibid.

place to which he had told him to go , bound prostrate on an inflated bag of ox-hide, and launched upon the river. Almost the whole army flocked to the riverside to see this strange sight. The officer was being carried hither and thither in the middle of the river at the mercy of the current. He was weeping imploring pardon with miserable cries, and trying to move the king to mercy. As he was carried past the royal pavilion, the king gave orders for him to be rescued from the river, entered in the inventories as royal property, exposed for sale in all the bazars and finally auctioned as a slave. He was bought by one of his friends for 80 pieces of gold, which were paid into the royal treasury". So besides punishing an erring officer mercilessly the usurious Akbar also made money in the bargain by trading him as a slave, and earning some money for his treasury.

Monserrate narrates how [59] "on emerging from the Gaybar (Khybar) pass and reaching the plain the king had several villages near the coas burnt, because their inhabitants had refused him grain and supplies on the way up." Shrewd as he was he did not retaliate on his way out lest his army be pounced upon in the narrow confines of the mountain pass or its retreat be cut off when it wanted to return to India.

Monserrate found that [60] "princes sentenced to imprisonment are sent to the jail at Goaleris

59. P. 156, ibid.
60. P. 211, ibid.

(Gwalior fort dungeons) where they rot away in chains and filth. Noble offenders are handed over to other nobles for punishment, but the base-born either to the captains of the despatch runners or to the chief executioner. This latter official is equipped even in the palace and before the king with many instruments of punishment, such as leather thongs, whips, bow-strings fitted with sharp spikes of copper, a smooth block of wood used for pounding the criminals' sides or crushing to pieces his skull, and scourges in which are tied a number of small balls studded with sharp bronze nails. (This latest weapon must, I think, be the one called by the ancients the scorpion). Various kinds of chains, manacles, handcuffs and other irons are hung up on one of the great palace gateways, which is guarded by the chief executioner."

Quite ahead of their times in realizing the value of mobile exhibits mediaeval Muslim rulers in India used to rig out displays of weird skeletons and mangled, stuffed bodies to terrorize their subjects into[61] submission. Akbar was no exception. "Wali Beg was looked upon by Akbar as the chief instigator of Behram Khan's rebellion. Wali Beg died of wounds received in battle. (Akbar) ordered his head to be cut off, which was (then) sent all over Hindusthan (for display). When it was brought to Etawa Bahadur Khan killed the foot soldiers that carried it."

61 Pp. 348, 349, Ain-i-Akbari, by Abul Fazal Allami, translated from the original Persian by H. Blochmann, second edition, Bibliotheca Indica series published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

IMMORALITY

Contemporary Muslim and European records prove that Akbar had an inordinate lust for women. In fact one of the chief motives of his wars of aggression against various rulers was to appropriate their harems. If the defeated adversaries were Muslims Akbar appropriated their teeming harems. If they were Hindus he compelled them under pain of cruel reprisals to surrender their sisters and daughters or other females.

Besides that Akbar had various other modes of acquiring comely women for his harem namely through obliging visitors or generals by way of gratification for the emperor's pleasure or as a sop to his anger, by direct interference with or trespass into the marital privacy of his subjects at his will and pleasure; by swooping on Hindu women about to go Sati (i.e. burn themselves on the pyre of their deceased husbands) and carrying them off to his harem, and also by capturing en masse the women of vanquished troops.

One may well imagine the lot of these helpless women retained in hordes to be at the beck and call of the emperor's lecherous pleasure when even the[1] "imperial consorts selected to accompany their lord were carried by she-elephants and shut up in decorated cages". To them life meant only

1. P. 267, Vincent Smith's Akbar the Great Mogul ibid.

a dumb, animal-like existence covered inside the burqa until discovered by the emperor.

Referring to contemporary Jesuit testimony Smith says[2] "The...experience of the first Jesuit mission under Aquaviva in 1582 proves, beyond possibility of doubt that at that time...Akbar habitually drank hard. The good father had boldly dared to reprove the emperor sharply for his licentious relations, with women. Akbar instead of resenting the priest's audacity, blushingly excused himself." Since Akbar inherited his drink addiction from all his forefathers the reproof by a Jesuit father could make no dent in Akbar's obsession.

Smith narrates a murderous attack on Akbar provoked by his wanting to abduct other people's wives[3]. "Early in January 1564," says Smith "Akbar moved to Delhi. On the 11th he was returning from a visit to the Nizamuddin shrine when a man standing on the balcony (of a madrasa) discharged an arrow which injured Akbar in the shoulder. The assailant was a slave (i.e. a Hindu) named Fulad. Akbar seems to have discouraged attempts to ascertain Fulad's accomplices. He was then engaged in a scheme for marrying certain ladies belonging to Delhi families, and had compelled one sheikh to divorce his wife in his favour. The attempted assassination put an end to these discreditable proceedings, and probably was prompted by the resentment at the royal invasion of the honour of families. Akbar through-

2. P. 82, ibid 3. P. 47, ibid.

out his life allowed himself ample latitude in the matter of wives and concubines."

Akbar's inordinate obsession for more and more and always different women is best illustrated by his conduct after his general Adham Khan had defeated Baz Bahadur, the debaucherous Muslim ruler of Malwa, at Sangrur near Dewas in Central India. Akbar was informed in his capital Agra that Adham Khan was retaining with him all the women of Baz Bahadur's harem. Nineteen-year-old Akbar incensed at the thought that the women who should have been in his harem were after all usurped by his general[4] "left Agra on April 27, 1561. Maham Anaga (the high priestess of Akbar's harem and the mother of Adham Khan, apprehensive of Akbar's cruel revenge on her miscreant son) sent swift courtiers to warn her son (about Akbar's departure). His submission was accepted only when his mother (Maham Anaga who quickly followed the emperor) came. (But, the villain that he was) he secretly stole two special beauties. (Akbar delayed his return to Agra until those two damsels were also surrendered). Maham perceived that if these two women were introduced to His Majesty her son's treachery would be revealed. She, therefore, caused the two innocent ones to be put to death (saying that the 'dead tell no tales'). The Khedive (Akbar) overlooked it and regarded the done as not done. Abul Fazal who records that atrocious deed was not ashamed to praise the wisdom and perspicocity of the guilty woman." This and other lavish praise that Abul

4. Pp. 37,38, ibid.

Fazal often bestows on this woman can only be plausible by his being made the lecherous beneficiary of the many harem women that Maham Anaga controlled.

A young Akbar, heir to an empire at the tender age of 14, having a large army of ruffians and barbarians at his command, a possessor of immense plundered wealth and a harem increasing by leaps and bounds everyday, was bound to be a very sexy person. And so he was. Smith says[5] "Abul Fazal never tires of repeating that Akbar during his early years remained behind a veil." If during his youthful years Akbar remained almost wholly in the arms and laps of the harem women, the time that he spent with women in the rest of his life was only slightly less.

After stripping his guardian and minister Behram Khan of all power, and ultimately murdering him Akbar was governed entirely by strumpets. Smith notes[6] "Akbar shook off the tutelage of Behram Khan only to bring himself under the influence of the monstrous regiment of unscrupulous women. He was subject to the petticoat government of the worst kind apparently taking no interest in the business of government which he allowed Maham Anaga to control. She was unworthy of the trust reposed in her."

The role of this woman, Maham Anaga has not been properly appraised. She was a pimp and a pander for Akbar and influential courtiers disbursing to them the largesse of harem beauties or

5. P. 31, ibid   6. Pp. 25, 26, ibid.

uglies according to their ranks, influence or coercive power. We have already recounted how she did not scruple in murdering two Hindu women just to save her son from Akbar's wrath.

Dealing with Akbar's craving for women Badayuni says[7] "It was at that place (Mathura) that His Majesty's intention of connecting himself by marriage (sic) with the nobles of Delhi was first broached and qawwals and eunuchs were sent into the harems for the purpose of selecting daughters of the nobles and investigating their conditions. And a great terror fell upon the city. Abdul Wasi's was a wonderfully beautiful and charming wife without a peer: One day the eyes of the emperor fell upon her. It is a law of the Mogul emperors that if the emperor cast his eyes with desire on any woman, the husband is bound to divorce her and the virtuous (sic) lady entered the imperial harem." This passage makes it clear that Akbar subjected all women in his realm to his close scrutiny either personally or through his henchmen, who were under orders to subject these women to a close personal physical check as potential whetstones for Akbar's lust. One can well imagine the horror of a situation when mighty officials of a despot, backed up with fierce-looking, armed-to-the teeth barbarians enter the dark, innermost curtained-off recesses of every house with the specific object of carrying off the beauties of any age and any status for the emperor's sexual gratification.

7. Pp. 59, 60 Vol. II, Muntakhabut Tawarikh by Abdul Qadir Badayani, ibid.

Many women or their elders were bound to have burnt themselves with fire or acid to render their faces ugly and unattractive to the royal abductors, many may have bribed the royal agents with ad hoc sexual gratification to escape permanent detention in the emperor's gilded cages and teeming harem; many may have been stripped nude to ascertain whether their form and physical allure was worthy of an emperor who could drag any woman to his harem with the force of his arms in a vast empire. This was yet another reason why Akbar was a terror and people used to flee in his wake. People dreaded him not only for his plunder of their wealth, not only his Torture and maiming their persons but the lifting of their women-folk whether wives, mothers, sisters or daughters.

Contemporary records also indicate that Akbar used his large stock of female beauties whether confined to his harem, prisons or serais, not only for his own gratification but also to exchange them with others or bestow them as gratification on visitors or courtiers. Smith says[8] "Grimson's statement that Akbar had confined himself to one wife, and distributed his other consorts among the courtiers is not directly confirmed from other sources. (Akbar) may have promised to do so or even asserted that he had made the sacrifice, but it does not follow that he actually kept such a promise or told the exact truth." Ain-i-Akbari Vol. III, p. 398 quotes

8. P. 185, Vincent Smith's "Akbar the Great Mogul," ibid.

Akbar's saying : "Had I been wise earlier, I would have taken no woman from my own kingdom into my seraglio, for my subjects are to me in the place of children." Such sanctimonious and hypocritical humbug liberally leavening accounts of Akbar's reign written by genuflexing chroniclers should not hoodwink the reader in a correct appraisal of Akbar's role in history.

The free traffic in women that was in vogue in Akbar's reign for offer as gratification to Akbar's officers, courtiers, or himself is illustrated by Badayuni. He says:[9] "In this year (A.H. 971) the emperor had Mirza Muqim of Isfahan together with Mir Yaqub of Kashmir put to death on a charge of being Shiahs. The two (had) brought to court the daughter of Husain Khan as a sort of a present." This indicates that anybody could lift anybody's daughter, sister or wife in Akbar's reign and gift her away or detain her in his own house.

Women wrested from their men folk by mass raids on localities or towns or after vanquishing a hostile force in battle were mercilessly handled as sexual cargo and then dumped in town to eke out a living as prostitutes. It was, therefore, that the number of these helpless women increased everyday in geometrical progression. Badayuni says[10] "Prostitutes of the imperial dominions had gathered together in the capital in such swarms as to defy counting or numbering. (Akbar) ap-

9. P. 128, Vol. II Badayuni's chronicle.
10. P. 311, ibid.

pointed a keeper, and a deputy and a secretary for their quarter so that anyone who wished to associate with these people or take them to his house, might with the connivance of the imperial officers have connection with any of them that he pleased. But he did not permit any man to take dancing girls to his house at night without conforming (to certain) conditions. But if anyone wished to have a virgin, if the petitioner was a well known courtier, he sent a petition (through) the deputy and obtained permission from court. Nevertheless in spite of the rules all the libertines carried on these affairs under assumed names, and so, drunkenness and debauchery led to many acts of bloodshed. And however many were brought to punishment another troop of delinquents would strut arrogantly past the inspector of that department. And a number of well known prostitutes (Akbar) called privately before him, and inquired (from them) who had seduced them.".

Muslim rule reduced Hindusthan to a great brothel and Akbar the king of Muslim kings gloried in being the king and chief patron of this vast brothel.

One of the main stipulations in treaties forced on vanquished foes was to surrender such of their women as Akbar or his officials wanted. By this method[11] "Akbar had introduced a whole host of the daughters of eminent Hinu Rajahs into his harem."

An instance of how day-in-and-day-out vast

11. P. 212, ibid.

numbers of women wrested from defeated foes were subjected to rape and prostitution is mentioned by Badayuni, who says[12] "Zain Khan Koka and Asaf Khan who had been appointed to punish the Afghans of Swat and Bajur, and to extirpate Jallalah the Roshanai, killed many of them and captured the wives and family of Jallalah and his brother Wahadat Ali with their relatives and bretheren to the numbers of near 14,000 and sent them to court. And of the rest of these prisoners who can take account!" It was these large drafts of women who were despatched to Akbar's court herded and hounded, who were used for free distribution among the vicious men who thronged Akbar's court, and to occasional visitors. The wretched condition of these women used as prey by sex-wolves would beggar description. They were subjected to uninhibited molestation, starvation or under-nourishment, filthy apartments, insults, menial duties, slavery and imprisonment in solitary cells of the burqa coming as close as the very tip of their noses.

[13]"(Akbar) was unable to give up his polygamous habits, and no importance need be attached to the bazar gossip of the time that he once intended to distribute his wives among the grandees," says the editor of an historical work. He is not quite right. The bazar gossip is substantially true.

12. P. 401, Badayuni's Muntakhabut Tawarikh, ibid.

13. Editor's introduction, to The Commentary, of Father Monserrate, S.J., on his journey to the court of Akbar, translated from the original Latin by J.S. Hoyland, and annotated by S.N. Banerjee, 1922, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London.

And yet there is no apparent contradiction between the two. It must be clearly understood that Akbar had no specific number of wives. He regarded the whole realm as his harem. All conquered or wrested women if found sufficiently attractive for the emperor were transferred for being part of his harem. This constantiy swelling stock of women he used for his own sexual gratification as well as of those whom he wanted to favour. This reconciles the two statements that Akbar was polygamous as well as he used to distribute his wives (namely the women that were at his mercy in the harem with whom he may or may not have actually cohabited) to his courtiers. Such distribution did not make even a whit of a difference to Akbar's over-married status because his stock of harem women was being constantly replenished to over-flowing and bursting by overcrowding.

Alluding to their frequent discussions about the relative merits of Christianity and Islam, with Akbar's courtiers Monserrate states how one of his colleagues[14] "Rudolf cast in their teeth the fact that their precious prophet in one passage (which he quoted) permitted the practice of unnatural and abominable vice (namely sodomy). When this fact was discovered, the Musalmans reddened with shame."

Despite Akbar's overtly professed friendliness towards the Portuguese his generals often swooped upon the latter. Referring to one such incident

14. P. 60, ibid.

Monserrate states[15] "In addition to this quarrel there was another regarding a ship captured by the Portuguese. The Mongols basely sent spies into the district of Damanas (Daman) under a pretence of friendship and when a Portuguese fleet under Jacobus Lopezius Coutignus was lying at the mouth of the Taphtus (Tapti) river they suddenly attacked out of an ambush laid at night. Nine sailors were captured, dragged in triumph to Surat, cruelly treated and on the next day executed for they had refused to become Musalmans even though promised riches, honours and beautiful and noble wives. The Mongols regarded this as a very generous offer. Their heads were brought to the King at Fattepuram (Fatehpur Sikri). Akbar pretended he had never heard of what had happened."

The 'wives' promised to neo-converts were invariably Hindu women enslaved and kept in reserve for prostitution and rape. They were rounded up after every battle or raid on peaceful Hindu localities. The word 'noble' is used in this case to describe those women only because they were to be used as bait for neo-converts. Usually Hindu women are invariably described in Muslim chronicles as whores, strumpets, slaves and dancing girls.

Non-molestation of the women of captured or vanquished foes was an act of special grace, big mercy and a rare exception. This is illustrated in the campaign undertaken to suppress the revolt of Masum Farankhudi. He was forced to leave his

15. P. 167, ibid.

treasure and family in the fort of Ayodhya. Akbar's general Shahbaz Khan occupied the fort and the city.[16] "Akbar mercifully ordered him not to molest the family and dependents of the rebel." And apparently this was no small mercy.

We have already noted in an earlier chapter that Akbar far from wanting to stop the custom of Sati (sorrowing Hindu widows burning themselves on their husbands' pyre) treated those mournful occasions as gala performances and grand spectacles to regale himself, his Muslim courtiers and foreigners. The few instances in which he is said to have interfered were to take away the widows to his own harem. We quote two instances:

[17]"The daughter of Rai Raisingh was wedded to Bir Bhadra, the son of Raja Ramchandra of Panna. When Ramchandra died Akbar sent his son to Panna to ascend the throne. When nearing the capital Bir Bhadra fell from the palanquin and died. His widow declared her intention to be a Sati. Akbar intervened." This, therefore, is not a mere abduction of a Sati but seems to be accompanied by a pre-meditated murder. Bir Bhadra having been at Akbar's court Akbar must have seen his wife and have had an eye on her. The incident has many suspicious details. How should Bir Bhadra fall from a palanquin before he reached his capital? And if at all he fell from the palanquin through accident how did that fall from a few feet prove so fatal as to kill him then and there?

16. P. 276, Vol. I, Akbar The Great, by Dr. Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastava, ibid.
17. P. 347, Shelat's "Akbar," ibid.

Another instance in which Akbar intervened is suspiciously similar to the one mentioned above [18]"Raja Bhagwandas's cousin Jaimull sent on duty in the eastern provinces, rode hard to comply with urgent orders, and died near Chausa from the effects of the heat and over-exertion. His widow, a daughter of Udai Singh (made preparations to go Sati). Akbar rode to the spot...and stopped it. The relatives were granted their lives and merely imprisoned. The exact location and date of the incident are not stated. Abul Fazal's narrative as usual is lacking in clearness and precision."

Discerning students of history must not take such garbled versons at their face value specially when Abul Fazal is universally dubbed to be a "shameless flatterer". They must examine and analyse them as detectives do. This is a precious rule of historical methodology. Reconstructing the above garbled and truncated version one finds that Jaimull was in excellent health since he was deputed on a mission. He must have died soon after he parted from his near and dear ones and colleagues at court. That shows that he must have been given a fake order to proceed on a mission and was pounced upon and killed as soon as he was defenceless and unaware. Akbar was obviously kept fully informed of the developments. That Akbar rode out immediately in person to the exact spot shows that Jaimull died very close to Akbar's palace. It also indicates that Akbar knew the exact spot because the murder was pre-meditated and hirelings had

18. P. 163, "Akbar the Great Mogul", ibid.

been posted to stage an ambush. When Jaimull's wife prepared to go Sati, it is said, Akbar rode all alone post haste. He is said to have reached there just at the nick of time riding like a hero from some literary romance, as though from behind a stage curtain. He did not trust any detachment of his army or police nor could he entrust the task to any officer under him. And since the widow's relatives obviously resented this blatant abduction Akbar is said to have arrested them and thrown them into dungeons. The episode ends abruptly there without mentioning what happened to the hero of the stage-managed show namely Akbar or the bereaved widow. After all her relations who had accompanied her to the cremation ground had been safely tucked out of the way by being imprisoned whom could Akbar send the poor, unattended widow to. Naturally very reluctantly poor Akbar had to give her shelter and protection (sic) in his own harem. Akbar's so-called prevention of Sati ultimately reveals cases of murder of the husband and abduction of the wife.

From the above two instances we can deduce Akbar's devious modus operandi of obtaining for himself the wives of those of his courtiers, whom he coveted. With this new insight students of history may scan other similar suspicious happenings.

After Durgawati was killed while battling with Akbar's invading forces a terrible jauhar (voluntary mass suicide by fire by Hindu women who considered this mode of death preferable to cruel molestation and humiliation at the hands of

Akbar's soldiers) followed as usual.[19] "The two women left alive, Kamalavati (sister of Rani Durgawati) and the daughter of the Raja of Purangad (daughter-in-law of the deceased warrior queen) were sent to Agra to enter Akbar's harem." Fanatic Muslim authors add that though Durgawati's son Bir Narayan had been married to the daughter of the Raja of Purangadh yet the marriage was not consummated. This is obviously a bluff meant to insinuate that Akbar admitted to his harem only virgins. If it was not so represented it was supposed to detract from a 'proud' Muslim monarch's reputation. The fanatic qazis, courtiers and Akbar himself would, therefore, tell the obliging scribes to record that the apparently married woman was to all intents and purposes a virtual virgin.

Akbar's court chronicler Abul Fazal known for his extreme flattery of his royal patron, tries to glorify even Akbar's womanizing as a burdensome duty graciously and condescendingly undertaken to set an example to the world. Abul Fazal says[20] "His Majesty is a great friend of good order and propriety in business. Through order the world becomes a meadow of truth and reality; and that which is but external receives through it a spiritual meaning. For this reason, the large number of women—a vexatious question even for great statesmen—furnished His Majesty with an opportunity to display his wisdom, and to rise from the low level of worldly dependence to the eminence

19. P. 90, 91, Shelat's "Akbar," ibid.
20. Ain 15, Ain-i-Akbari, by Abul Fazal, ibid.

of perfect freedom. The imperial palace and household are, therefore, in the best order'"

This is a typical example of sycophant humbug which is followed by an equally preposterous statement that "His Majesty forms matrimonial alliances with the princes of Hindusthan and of other countries; and secures by these ties of harmony the peace of the world." Akbar's raids on Hindu kingdoms were meant to abduct the princesses of devout and pious Hindu rulers for his own harems steeped in drink and drug-addiction and orgies of murder and massacre. Hindu rulers rather preferred to burn their women than have them fall into Akbar's hands. Abul Fazal's remark that Akbar's kidnapping raids brought about world unity and peace, amounts to adding insult to injury. It is not for nothing that he is called a "shameless flatterer."

Describing Akbar's harem Abul Fazal says[21] "His Majesty has made a large enclosure with fine buildings inside, where he reposes. Though there are more than 5,000 women he has given to each a separate apartment. He has also divided them into sections, and keeps them attentive to their duties. Several chaste (sic) women have been appointed as darogahs and superintendents over each section, and one has been selected for duties of a writer."

Abul Fazal's assertion that each one of the 5,000 was given a suite of rooms in a large enclosure is a despicable lie. Nowhere in India

21. ibid.

do we find ruins of Akbar's times containing 5,000 suites of rooms.

Akbar's lust for women was so prodigious that even courtiers' wives were not safe. Badayuni says[22] "Whenever Begams or nobles' wives or other women desire to be presented they first notify their wish and wait for a reply. Those eligible are permitted to enter the harem. Some women of rank obtain permission to remain there for a whole month. Notwithstanding the great number of faithful guards, His Majesty does not dispense with his own vigilance...."

Scrutinizing the above passage we would like to ask : what married woman would yearn to be molested by Akbar? Could there be so many women, all wives of courtiers, who would so yearn to enter Akbar's harem, as to indefatigably pilot their applications for special entry into Akbar's harem, from pillar to post? Was the admittance to Akbar's harem a matter of such rare privilege for the wives of courtiers that they should consider it a rare honour to be away from their own husbands, homes and children for cohabitation with Akbar? The words "those (found) eligible" only mean : women whom Akbar found sufficiently attractive so as to feel impelled to drag them to his own harem. The phrase "obtain permission to remain there for a whole month" means that Akbar used to detain his courtiers' wives (and of course daughters and sisters) if he enjoyed their company, at least for a month. But here it need not be added that the month's limit is meanigless. If Akbar could have others' wives for a month what prevented him from detaining them longer or even permanently?

22. Ain 15, Ain-i-Akbari, ibid.

The last sentence that though there were plenty of faithful guards Akbar remained vigilant only means that these women were obviously wrested from their homes by force and detained under dire threats. Such seemingly innocuous passages hide a very sinister meaning and reveal the most savage and lecherous conditions prevailing during Akbar's reign.

Akbar also took great interest in maintaining huge brothels close to his palace, and found time to keep an account of how many of the prostitutes were virgins, and also to talk to them. Abul Fazal recounts:[23] "His Majesty (has) established a wine shop near the palace. The prostitutes of the realm who had collected could scarcely be counted, so large was their number. (Their locality was called Shaitanpura or Devil's Ville). The dancing girls used to be taken home by courtiers. If any well known courtiers wanted to have a virgin they would first have His Majesty's permission. In the same way boys prostituted themselves, and drunkenness and ignorance soon led to bloodshed. . . His Majesty himself called some of the principal prostitutes and asked them who had deprived them of their virginity?"

In Muslim chronicles the word "prostitutes" many a time connotes Hindu women who were dragged into slavery and prostitution after their husbands and brothers were killed in Muslim raids.

The above passage reveals the most shocking civic life that existed in Akbar's times. It speaks

23. P. 276, Ain-i-Akbari, ibid.

of sodomy, prostitution, drunken brawls and murderous assaults. That there should be a regular flourishing sodomic service on a very large scale must be considered a rare, unique, unparalleled 'embellishment' of Akbar's reign.

Sodomy was a 'precious' heritage of Akbar's own family. Akbar's grandfather Babur has, in his memoirs, given a lengthy description of his sodomic infatuation for a male sweetheart while his mother used to coax him out of his reluctance to go to his own wife with whom Babur was not on good terms. His son Humayun, also had picked handsome lads always at hand. Akbar himself maintained a whole regiment of catamites near his palace as Abul Fazal mentions.

It was not uncommon during Akbar's time for courtiers to have male sweethearts in their retinue. About one such Abul Fazal says[24] "In the 12th year it was reported that Muzaffar loved a boy named Qutb. Akbar had the boy forcibly removed, whereupon Muzaffar assumed the garb of a fakir, and went into the forest. Akbar was thus obliged to recall him, and restored the beloved."

Another instance reminiscent of Muslim society of mediaeval times is of[25] "Adil Shah (who) was murdered in 988 A. H. by a young handsome eunuch whom he attempted to use for an immoral purpose. The king was known for his mania for boys and unnatural crimes. He obtained with some

24. P. 374, ibid.
25. P. 520, ibid.

exertion two young and handsome eunuchs from Malik Barid of Bedar, and was stabbed by the elder of the two at the first attempt of satisfying his inordinate desires." This indicates that select handsome boys were precious commodity under mediaeval Muslim rule to be covetuously sought, bought or presented for the perverse gratification of superiors, along with women, wine and wealth. Any number of such instances of sodomy prevalent on a very wide scale may be quoted from Muslim chronicles.

Abul Fazal mentions yet another instance:[26] "Shah Quli Mahram-i-Baharlu was passionately attached to a dancing boy of the name of Qabul Khan; and as the Emperor had the boy forcibly removed, Shah Quli dressed as jogi went into the forests. Behram traced him with much trouble and brought him back, when the boy was restored to him. The emperor from goodwill towards him, admitted him to his femal apartments. After the first time he had been allowed to enter the harem, he went home and had his testicles removed. Maharam means one admitted to the harem. He died at Agra in 1010 A.H. At Narnaul where he chiefly lived he erected many splendid buildings and dug large tanks."

The above passage is a curious blend of chicanery and fraud. No one would voluntarily castrate himself. The passage only indicates that Akbar used to compulsorily castrate those unfortunate males whom he chose to keep a watch over his harem.

26. P. 385, ibid.

This is a new high in cruelty, lechery and torture. And to say that a castrated catamite raised majestic mansions and dug large tanks is the height of shameless academic audacity and fraudulent concoction. This is how ancient Hindu buildings have been ascribed to various Muslims by cheats and forgers posing to be chronicle-writers.

Another form of lechery practised by Akbar in his own grand, royal style of cruelty and repression was to force his subjects to parade their women for him to fool with exclusively. Col. Tod mentions this unique institution conceived by Akbar's inventive genius. Tod states:[27] "The Noroza or 'New Year's Day" is not New Year's Day but a festival especially instituted by Akbar, and to which he gave the epithet Khusroz, a day of pleasure, held on the 9th day (No-roza), following the chief festival of each month. The Khusroz was chiefly marked by a fair held within the precincts of the court, attended only by females. The merchants' wives exposed the manufactures of every clime and the ladies of the court were the purchasers. 'His Majesty is also there in disguise by which means he learns the value of merchandise, and hears what is said of the state of the empire and the character of the officers of the government.' The ingeneous Abul Fazal thus softens down the unhallowed purpose of this day; but posterity cannot admit that the

27. Pp. 274, 275, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan by Lt. Col. James Tod, in two volumes, 1957 Reprint, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., Broadway House, 68-74 Carter Lane, London, E.C.4.

great Akbar was to obtain these results amidst the Pushto jargon of the dames of Islam or the mixed Bhaka of the fair of Rajasthan. These ninth day fairs are the markets in which Rajput honour was bartered and to which the brave Prithviraj makes allusion (in the poem that he composed and is alleged to have sent to rekindle Rana Pratap's flagging spirit of dogged resistance to Akbar's aggressive onslaughts)...There is not a shadow of doubt that many of the noblest of the race (of Rajputs) were dishonoured on the No-roza, and the chivalrous Prithviraj was only preserved from being of the number by the high courage and virtue of his wife, a princess of Mewar and a daughter of the founder of the Suktawats. On one of these celebrations of the Khusroz the monarch of the Moguls was struck with the beauty of the daughter of Mewar and he singled her out from amidst the united fair of Hind as the object of his passion. It is not improbable that an ungenerous feeling united with that already impure, to despoil the Sisodias of their honour through a princess of their house under the protection of the sovereign. On retiring from the fair she found herself entangled amidst the labyrinth of apartments by which egress was purposely ordained, when Akbar stood before her. But instead of acquiescence, she drew a poinard from her corset and held it to his breast, dictating and making him repeat the oath of renunciation of the infamy to all her race. Rae Singh, the elder brother of the princely bard had not been so fortunate. His wife wanted either courage or virtue to withstand the regal tempter, and she returned to their dwelling in the desert

despoiled of her chastity but loaded with jewels; or as Prithviraj expresses it: 'She returned to her abode, tramping to the tinkling sound of the ornaments of gold and gems on her person; but where, my brother, is the moustache on they lip?"

Above is just a random sampling of Akbar's gross venery. It is enough to convince an impartial reader that Akbar's whole career was a saga of uninhibited licentiousness indulged in with barbaric abandon backed with the brutal force of a huge army of hoodlums rampaging over a vast empire.

DRINK AND DOPE ADDICTION

Akbar was an incorrigible addict of strong spirituous liquors and stupefying drugs. Usually a conscience heavy with the burden of brutal crimes piling up from day to day has to find an escape valve in stupefaction. This addiction was Akbar's 'precious' ancestral heritage. The entire atmosphere in which Akbar was brought up reeked with strong drinks, stupefying drugs, murderous plots and counter-plots and womanizing.

Smith quotes Terry's account of Asaf Khan's banquet to say:[1] "His sovereign (Akbar), as is well known, had no scruples on the subject, and drank more or less heavily, generally more during the greater part of his life." Smith adds "Intemperance was the besetting sin of the Timuroid royal family, as it was of many other Muslim ruling families. Babur (Akbar's paternal grandfather) was an elegant toper. Humayun (Akbar's father) made himself stupid with opium. Akbar permitted himself the practice of both vices. Some of the mad freaks in which he indulged while under the influence of liquor have been narrated (in contemporary chronicles). The evil example set by the sovereign was followed only too faithfully by the princes and nobles. Akbar's two younger sons died in early manhood from chronic alcholism, and their elder brother was saved from the same fate by a strong constitution, not by virtue. The biographies of the nobles recorded by Blochmann record a surprising number of deaths due to intemperance. One of the most conspicuous victims of that vice was Mirza Jani Beg of Sind, who drank himself to death in the Deccan soon after the fall of Asirgarh. Another noble of high rank (Shahbaz Khan, No. 57) used to drink a terrible mixture of wine, hemp and two forms of opium. Many other examples might be cited."

1. P. 294. Vincent Smith's 'Akbar the Great Mogul.'

Smith records[2] how when Akbar "had drunk more than was good for him he performed various mad freaks. At Agra he galloped the elephant 'Hawai', across the bridge of boats, and at Surat tried to fight his sword. He specially fancied a very heady toddy. As an alternative at that period (1580) he used to take a spiced infusion of opium. He followed the practice of his family for many generations in consuming both strong drink and various preparations of opium sometimes to excess."

[3]"The Jesuit testimony concerning the experience of the first mission under Aquaviva in 1582 proves, beyond the possibility of doubt, that at that time, some nine years after the fall of Surat Akbar habitually drank hard. The good father had boldly dared to reprove the emperor sharply for his licentious relations with women. Akbar instead of resenting the priest's audacity, blushingly excused

2. P. 244, ibid.
3. P. 82, ibid.

himself, and even sought to subdue the flesh by fasting for several days. The abstinence was not extended to include liquor. He went to such excess in drinking that the merit of fasting was lost in the demerit of inebriation. Sometimes Akbar seemed to forget Padre Rudolfo altogether, allowing long intervals to elapse without summoning him. Even if he did invite the priest to say something about God, he had hardly begun before Akbar fell asleep, the reason being that he made too much use, sometimes of arrack, an extremely heady palm wine, and sometimes of post, a similar preparation of opium, diluted and modified by various admixtures of spices. His bad example in the matter of inebriety was followed only too faithfully by his three sons who attained manhood. Two of them, Murad and Daniyal, died from the effects of their chronic intemperance, and Salim never freed himself from the vice altogether."

[4]A "queer story narrated by Abul Fazal (says) there was (once) a select drinking party. The talk turned upon the disregard for life shown by the heroes of Hindusthan. It was said that two Rajputs would run from opposite sides against the point of a double-headed spear, held by third parties so that the points would transfix both of the rivals and come out at their backs. (Hearing this) Akbar had the hilt of his sword fixed in the wall and announced that he would rush against it. Raja Mansingh kicked down the sword and doing so cut his sovereign's hand. Akbar promptly knocked

4. P. 81, ibid.

down Mansingh and squeezed him hard. Sayyid Muzaffar had to twist Akbar's hand to release his hold on Mansingh's throat. Akbar must have been shockingly drunk."

[5]"Although the uncritical panegyrists of Akbar make no mention of his drunken bouts, and his published sayings include phrases condemnatory of excess in wine, it is certain that for many years he kept up the family tradition and often drank more than he could carry. Jehangir remarks 'My father whether in his cups or sober moments alway called me 'Shekhu Baba'. The phrase clearly implied that the writer's father was not seldom in his cups."

With his usual cunning Akbar's chronicler tries to gloss over Akbar's failings. Abul Fazal says[6] that Akbar "does not drink much, but pays much attention to (the Abdar Khana) matters. Both at home and on travels he drinks Ganges water." Probably Abul Fazal means that strong liquors passing down Akbar's throat became transformed into sacred Ganges water or that to offset the effects of drinks and dopes Akbar washed them down with Ganga water. Probably the reference to Ganga water is meant only to hoodwink Akbar's Hindu subjects who formed a vast majority.

[7]"Whenever His Majesty wishes to take wine, opium or kuknar (he calls the latter 'sabras' i.e. the quintessence of all dopes and drinks) the servants place before him the stands of fruit."

5. P. 82 ibid. 6. P. 57, Ain-i-Akbari, by Abul Fazal Allami, translated by H. Blochmann, ibid.
7. P. 69, ibid.

Either Akbar should have been an idiot to allow his servants to lay fruits before him when he asked for wine and dope or the servants should have been given the authority to override Akbar's commands and like stern governesses they must be compelling him to accept fruit in place of wine and drugs. A third alternative which seems more probable is that 'fruit' is the flatterer Abul Fazal's code word for the dreaded liquors and drugs that his imperial master habitually consumed.

Father Monserrate a Jesuit priest who was at Akbar's court, says[8] "Akbar quenches his thirst with 'post' or water. When he has drunk immoderately of 'post' he sinks back stupified and shaking."

Akbar's preference for drunkards like him is illustrated by a contemporary chronicler Badayuni who says[9] "His Majesty appointed Qazi Abdus Sami as Qazi-ul-Quzat who used to play chess for a wager, and to give great odds. His cup-draining was notoriously a congenital habit, and in his sect bribery and corruption were considered as a duty for the moment."

Chronicler Ferishta observes:[10] "At this time (1582 A.D.) the king was taken dangerously ill of a

8. P. 199, Monserrate's Commentary, ibid.

9. P. 324, Badayuni, ibid.

10. P. 156, Vol. II, "History of the Rise of the Mohamedan Power in India, till the year A.D. 1612." translated from the original Persian of Mahommed Kasim Ferishta, by John Briggs, published by S. Dey 59-A Shanbazar Street, Calcutta-4. (Reprinted Calcutta, 1966 A.D.)

bowel-complaint; and as His Majesty had adopted the habit of eating opium, as Hoomayun, his father had done before him, people became apprehensive on his account."

Even a common man is considered bad and dangerous company if he is a drunkard and a drug-addict. If like Akbar he is backed by a ferocious army of barbarians who have the potential of mowing down all opposition one may well imagine the menace he is to humanity at large. Akbar's reign was, therefore, one of the darkest periods of Indian history, when a large part of India was subject to his drunken despotism and mischief.

A Sanskrit adage says:
Youth, wealth, power and intemperance
Each singly may spell ruin
Imagine the havoc when they all combine.

Akbar's reign well illustrates the truth of that maxim.

THE SO: CALLED MARRIAGES WERE BLATANT UBDACTIONS

Akbar's much vaunted marital adventures often rhapsodically described as lyrical symphonies in inter-communal harmony and lofty essays in statesmanship were nothing but blatant abductions.

We have already noted in an earlier chapter how Sheikh Abdul Wasi was highhandedly bereft of his attractive and alluring wife. History does not find trace of Abdul Wasi after he was robbed of his wife. In all probability he was murdered by one of Akbar's own hirelings.

Even Akbar's own guardian the elderly Behram Khan met with the same fate because Akbar had an eye on his wife Salima Sultan Begum. This lady was Akbar's father's sister's daughter. Depriving her husband Behram Khan of all power and position at court and later murdering him only to grab his wife for his own harem was a heinous crime on Akbar's part. It was also very ungrateful because it was Behram Khan who had chaperoned minor Akbar to his throne steering Akbar's career through a number of formidable challenges.

Dr. A.L. Shrivastava says[1] that as early as 1557, when Akbar was only 15 years old, Behram Khan suspected a conspiracy against him when one day

1. P. 41, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.

on the way back from Mankot the royal elephants stampeded into ailing Behram Khan's tent. That was Akbar's way of displaying his royal anger against Behram Khan who got married to Salima at Jullundur when the army was on its way from Mankot (in Jammu territory) to Lahore. Thereafter Behram Khan was systematically hounded. Many more times Akbar's elephants stampeded into Behram Khan's tent. Probably Akbar's intention was to have Behram Khan trampled to death. Gradually stripped of all power Behram Khan was overthrown in open combat, exiled, chased to Pattan and murdered. Partisan contemporary accounts have often tried to show that Behram Khan was murdered by an Afghan who bore him a private grudge. Such accounts, written by court flatterers, could never be expected to indict Akbar of Behram Khan's murder when they were subservient to a wily and ferocious Akbar who wielded despotic power. That it was Akbar who caused Behram Khan's murder is apparent from the fact that Behram Khan was hounded from the very day that he was engaged to Salima Sultan. At the time of his murder he was not alone but was accompanied by a large group of adherents. Soon after he was murdered his wife Salima Sultan, whom Akbar had long coveted, was speedily sent to Akbar's harem along with her four-year-old son Abdur Rahim who later rose to be Khan Khanan. Stripping the highest loyal servant of the crown of all his power and then of his life and lastly of his wife because of a 15-year-old Akbar's infatuation for Behram Khan's legally wedded wife was a ghastly crime.

Indian histories have also been stained by a base falsehood about Akbar's so-called marriage with Jaipur's Hindu royal family. This marriage has been paraded as a shining example of inter-communal integration brought about by Akbar's statesmanship.

This episode is emphatic proof of how the communalist and politician have falsified Indian history to bolster their own imaginary theories.

Most histories state that while 19-year-old Akbar was on his way from Agra to Ajmer to pay homage at the shrine of the tomb of Sheikh Moin uddin Chisti, and while he was passing through Sambhar, an elderly brave and proud Rajput ruler Bharmal of Jaipur hurried thither and offered his daughter in marriage. This is an atrocious falsehood. Even on the face of it it is absurd. Anyone who knows the spirit and tradition of the mediaeval Rajputs, but does not know anything of history would spot out this version as spurious. That a leading member of a community who preferred to burn their women in a mass bonfire rather than see their honour and chastity defiled by alien marauders should hasten to willingly and voluntarily surrender his daughter to Akbar, is a base calumny against the fair name of proud Rajasthan. The real story is very heart-rending. But it has been carefully suppressed and its bits have been very carefully swept under Akbar's bed-chamber carpet.

An account of what made Bharmal swallow his Rajput pride and surrender his beloved daughter

to Akbar's harem may be gleaned from Dr. A. L. Shrivastav's book[2]. Bharmal, the ruler of Jaipur, was reduced to humiliating submission by Sharfuddin, a commander of Akbar's forces, through repeated terror and horror raids on Bharmal's principality. In these raids he succeeded in capturing and holding as hostages three Rajput princes: Khangar, Rajsingh and Jagannath. They were incarcerated at Sambhar and apparently threatened with torturous death. It was to redeem those three princes that the chastity of Bharmal's daughter was sacrificed at Akbar's harem door. In ordinary circumstances even the nail of a Rajput damsel's toe or finger, as they say, was never exposed to the lecherous gaze of a foreigner, and a marauder at that.

Dr. Shrivastava observes: "The Kachwaha chief (Bharmal) faced extinction and hence in a helpless condition sought the intercession of and an alliance with Akbar." That was the reason why, soon after the Rajput damsel was surrendered the three princes were released. That was why the transaction took place at a wayside place and not at Bharmal's capital or at Akbar's capital either. It was too shameful and heart-rending a surrender for Bharmal to enact in his own hometown, in the heart of the glorious Rajasthan and in the midst of his own kith and kin. It was considered most shameful and worse than perdition for a Rajput to have to surrender his daughter to a Muslim. It

2. Pp. 61-63 of Dr. A. L. Shrivastava's book 'Akbar the Great,' Vol. I contain an accouut of the abduction wrongly described as a marriage.

was, therefore, no fun for Bharmal to take that fateful decision. It was worse than death for a proud Rajput. But he felt he had no alternative. To him the choice was to allow his three princes to be tortured to death and later see the whole of his realm laid waste with similar atrocities or to ask for an abject peace by losing his daughter. Bharmal who could not apparently steel his heart as did the immortal Rana Pratap, preferred the meek alternative of shameful surrender, to a brave, fighting resistance.

Akbar left the very next day for Agra with the surrendered girl euphemistically called the 'bride.' That is to say there were no marriage festivities. In those days royal wedding rejoicings and feasts lasted for months. Why did this one end in a day!

What is euphemistically described as a huge dowry consisting of thousands of horses with gold saddles, elephants, jewellery and cash, was nothing but a ransom.

Dr. Shrivastava has also mentioned that the people of Deosa and the surrounding region had fled in Akbar's wake. That proves that Akbar was dreaded like a tiger on the prowl and was not welcomed as a smiling royal bridegroom.

"Near Ranthambhor Bharmal's sons, grandsons and other relatives were introduced to Akbar," says Dr. Shrivastava. This means that they were not present at the so-called wedding. It was but natural that they should not be present at the humiliating surrender of their princess. Had it

been a wedding they would all have been present at Sambhar.

Another clue is that Bharmal negotiated this deal of surrendering his daughter for securing the release of the three princes, through a Muslim named Chagtai Khan. Had it been a wedding a Rajput ruler would never employ a Muslim as the go-between.

Soon after Bharmal's surrender had been obtained Akbar directed Sharfuddin to similarly ravage another Rajput principality—Merta. All accounts which describe this transaction as a wedding, are therefore, gross concoctions. Though Akbar didn't much care he couldn't have had any objection to glorify this shameful surrender as a marriage. So far as Bharmal was concerned it was but natural that he would wish this abject surrender painted as a voluntary wedding. But it is for posterity to scan the circumstances and refuse to be hoodwinked by political concoctions.

Dr. Shrivastava who believes that the wedding (sic) of Akbar with Bharmal's daughter was "celebrated in the most admirable manner" (p. 62 of his book) takes a somersault and says in a footnote on page 113 "No mediaeval Hindu, however low in social status, liked a marriage with a Muslim, though of royal blood, as in Hindu eyes the mere touch of a Muslim was defilement or pollution."

While encamped at Mandavgadh Akbar similarly "demanded the hand of the daughter of

3. P. 113, Vol. 1, Akbar the Great, by Dr. Shrivastava, ibid.

Mirza Mubarak Shah, ruler of Khandesh. She was brought by Aitimad Khan, the principal eunuch and entered Akbar's harem in September 1564." This again is clearly not a marriage because the girl was brought and dumped in Akbar's harem by a military general who humiliated the Khandesh ruler with the force of arms.

[4]"Akbar married (sic) the daughter of Kahan, brother of Kalyanmal. Kalyanmal was the ruler of Bikaner. His son Raisingh was taken into service but Kalyanmal being too fat to ride a horse was allowed to return to Bikaner."

This too was no wedding but an abject surrender. In none of these so-called marriages's is the daughter's name ever mentioned because her chastity was a mere chattel to be bartered away on surrender to save despoilation of the entire realm at the hands of ravaging Muslim armies. Had the ruler of Bikaner, Kalyanmal been really taken into service by Akbar as a mark of special favour, allowing him to return to Bikaner wouldn't have arisen. The fact that he was "allowed" to return shows that he was forced to buy his freedom by surrendering his brother's daughter and also throwing in a large ransom into the bargain. In this case it is clear that he must not have had a daughter of his own, at least one marriageable. Had he one he would have been forced to surrender his own daughter to Akbar in addition to his brother's.

[5]"Jaisalmir's (ruler) Rawal Har Rai gave (sic) his daughter in marriage to Akbar" says Dr. A.L.

4. & 5. Pp. 126-127, Akbar the Great, ibid.

Shrivastava, significantly adding "Raja Bhagwandas was sent to Bikaner to bring the princess to the royal camp." It may be noted that in each one of these so-called weddings Akbar's generals like municipal darogahs rounding up stray cows, equipped with the lassos of military detachments, used to drag the poor helpless princess to Akbar's harem from the unwilling and sorrowing bosoms of their parents.

The brave Bidhichand ruler of Kangra alias Nagarkot when reduced to submission remitted, besides other valuables, five maunds of gold "but he did not fulfil the other terms such as sending of a dola to Akbar's harem and acknowledging Mugal suzerainty." A footnote quotes chronicler Badayuni that "the Mugals riddled with arrows the golden umbrella over the image of Goddess Jwalamukhi, slew 200 black cows maintained by the temple for worship, and filling their shoes with the slaughtered cows' blood splashed the floor and walls of the temple with it." That despite such atrocities and having been made to pay a heavy ransom Bidhichand refused to surrender the women of his family shows how high the Rajputs held the honour of their women and how low mean Akbar's behaviour was in collecting in his harem women wrested with military force from his subdued adversaries.

"Rawal Pratap the ruler of Banswara and Rawal Askaran of Dungarpur were persuaded to wait on Akbar," says[7] Dr. Shrivastava. "They

6. Pp. 143-144, ibid
7. Pp. 213-15, Vol. 1, Akbar the Great, ibid.

became his vassals. Akbar 'married' the daughter of the Dungarpur ruler. The negotiations were conducted by Lon Karan and Birbar, who brought the lady to Akbar's camp, when the latter was on his return journey to Fatehpur Sikri."

The above passage is a typical example of how very blindly Indian histories have been written. The words "persuaded to wait on Akbar" clearly means that they were forced and humiliated through subjugation. How complete their humiliation was is proved by the surrender of the Dungarpur daughter. That it was no marriage is clear from the fact that Lon Karan and Birbar dragged the helpless girl from the protective custody of her helpless father and dumped her in Akbar's harem while he was on the way to Fatehpur Sikri. Dishonouring Rajput princesses and molesting them had become a principal tenet of Akbar's rule and life. By a cruel irony this insult and humiliation has been glorified as a magnanimous gesture of Akbar. Such partiality and blatant falsehoods are perhaps unparalleled elsewhere in world literature and academic text books.

Sheikh Abdun Nabi who objected to Akbar's numerous marriages[8] was exiled to Mecca against his will. On return to India in 1583 he died in suspicious circumstances, obviously murdered by Akbar. As a fanatic Muslim Abdun Nabi did not object to Akbar's taking Hindu girls. His protest was against Akbar invading even the privacy of Muslim families like that of Abdul Wasi.

8. Pp. 231-232, ibid.

Akbar not only forced his subdued foes to surrender their women to his own harem but also for his sons and other relations. [9]"Ali Rai of Little Tibet with a view to his own security proposed the marriage of his daughter with Prince Salim. The lady was brought to Lahore and the marriage was performed on January 1, 1592."

The above passage again shows that Little Tibet was threatened with total destruction by ravage unless the ruler agreed to send his daughter to prince Salim's harem. Likewise on[10] "June 26, 1586 in Lahore Prince Salim's second marriage was performed with the daughter of Rai Singh of Bikaner." To call this a 'marriage' is hypocrisy. It was 'held' in distant Lahore and not at Bikaner because the ruler of Bikaner was obviously ashamed of having to surrender his daughter to an alien maraudar. He dare not' celebrate any marriage (sic) of his daughter with a Muslim potentate in his capital for fear of public obloquy.

The chronicler Ferishta describes how the daughter of the Bijapur ruler was kidnapped for Akbar's son Daniyal. In 1600 A. D.[11] "Ibrahim Adil Shah of Bijapur sent an ambassador to conciliate Akbar and consented (sic) to give his daughter in marriage to his son Prince Daniyal Mirza. A Mogul noble named Meer Jamaluddin Husain Anjoe, was accordingly despatched to escort the bride from Bijapur. In June 1604 Meer Jamaluddin

9. P. 354, ibid.
10. Pp. 354-357, Akbar the Great, ibid
11. Pp. 173-174, Vol. II, Briggs' translation of Ferishta's chronicle, ibid.

Husain returned with the royal bride and the stipulated dowry (sic). He delivered the young sultana to Daniyal upon the banks of the Godavari near Paithan where the nuptials were celebrated with great magnificence (sic), after which Meer Jamaluddin Husian proceeded to join the king at Agra. On April 8, 1605 Daniyal died in Burhanpur owing to excess of drinking."

It is apparent from the above description that the Bijapur ruler's daughter was kidnapped under duress. The celebrations were not of the marriage but of the successful abduction of another's girl. Her name did not matter and therfore is not mentioned. Daniyal died within a few months of the poor hapless girl's abduction. Left to himself the Bijapur ruler would not have given his daughter to a depraved drunkard sprawled on the brink of his grave.

Mr. Shelat mentions two weddings (sic) of prince Salim with Hindu princesses. He says[12] "On February 2, 1584 the marriage of Prince Salim with the daughter of Raja Bhagwandas was celebrated at Lahore with grear pomp. In June 1586 the wedding of Rai Singh's daughter with Salim was celebrated at the house of Bhagwandas."

The learned anthor has been mistaken in thinking that the celebrations were for the marriages. That they were no marriages but abductions is apparent from the fact that the girl's name is not mentioned, and that she was brought to distant Lahore. The celebrations were to gloat over the

12. P. 196, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat, ibid,

subjugation. In the latter case Rai Singh's daughter was brought to Bhagwandas's house in Lahore from her unwilling parents in distant Rajasthan and then handed over to Jehangir. Bhagwandas's family had since the days of his father Bharmal rolled up and drowned its Rajput pride and allowed to be lifted as many women as Akbar and his successors liked. For them, therefore, it was some consolation to see other brother Rajput rulers similarly humbled and humiliated. With that view Bhagwandas and his adopted son Mansingh were frequent agents for Akbar and his sons to abduct Rajput princesses. It was on one such occasion that Rai Raisingh's daughter was made over for Jehangir's harem from Bhagwandas's Lahore home.

Badayuni says[13] "Salim in his 16th year married the daughter of Raja Bhagwandas. The Raja gave as his daughter's dowry several strings of horses and boys and girls of Abyssinia, India and Circassia, and all sorts of golden vessels set with jewels, and jewels and utensils of gold, and vessels of silver and all sorts of stuffs, the quantity of which is beyond computation. And to each one of the Amirs, who were present, according to their station and rank, he gave Persian, Turkish and Arabian horses with golden saddles..."

This description should serve as a sample of the lavish ransom that subdued Rajput rulers were required to surrender along with their beloved daughters and sisters to alien invaders. To describe

13. P. 352, Vol. II Muntakhabut Tawarikh, by Al Badayuni, ibid.

it as dowry is a travesty of truth. Who would want to give well brought up, beautiful daughters to aliens who were drunkards, drug-addicts, massacrers and haters of Hindus and Hindusthan ! Even the very Rajputs who allowed themselves to be ultimately subdued and humiliated did so after stiff resistance and burning of their women en masse in bonfires. It was only when their flagging spirits seemed to wither away and wince under unending and colossal Muslim atrocities that they decided to submit and purchase a semblance of peace at any cost.

Indian histories have no right to twist facts, warp the truth and give a wedding-wash to blatant abductions, and thereby rub galling insult into the injuries inflicted on the brave Rajputs by alien invaders in wars of attrition.

Histories must be impartial. The historian must not assume the role of a politician or of the politician's handmaid to twist truth or varnish dastardly acts. The reader expects the historian to properly investigate the truth and present it without adding any gloss of his own. Current Indian historical texts, generally speaking, do not fulfil this role.

Administrators or politicians, may add their own homilies or footnotes when presenting historical facts to their audiences but the histories as such must state only the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. In the case of the so-called marriages of Akbar and his sons the plain fact is that they were all blatant abductions.

Chapter VIII

CONQUESTS

It has been mistakenly asserted or insinuated in average Indian historical text books that Akbar's conquests were intended to wipe out smaller principalities into which India was divided only to weld them into one strong, united, homogenous nation. Such an assertion pre-supposes that Akbar was an Indian and that he was bubbling over with patriotic fervour and innate love for the future of India and the overwhelming majority of her citizens, the Hindus. Both these assumptions being wrong the conclusion derived from them is also unwarranted.

Akbar was not an Indian either in thought, mind, body or deed. He was an absolute alien, an aggressor and an aggrandizer whose conquests were meant to ruthlessly mow down the Indian people and their culture for self-glorification at the cost of the people's lives, property and honour.

Vincent Smith rightly observes[1] that "Akbar was a foreigner in India. He had not a drop of Indian blood in his veins. He was a direct descendant in the seventh generation from Tamerlain (on his father's side). He was descended through Babur's mother, the daughter of Yunus Khan, Grand Khan of the Moguls, from Chagatai, the second son of Chingiz Khan, the Mongol scourge

1. P. 7, Akbar the Great Mogul, by Vincent Smith, ibid.

of Asia in the 13th century...His mother was a Persian."

By descent, therefore, Akbar was an absolute alien. It is then argued that though not an Indian by descent Akbar was an Indian by choice because he and two of his ancestors and his descendants made India their home. Many readers are taken in and misled for the whole of their lives by such cant. Had Akbar really merged his identity, language, culture and religion with that of the majority of the Indians namely Hindus, he could certainly have been entitled to be deemed a naturalized Indian. If retaining his own separate religion and culture he would have devoted his life to the welfare of the Hindus he could still have been deemed deserving of gratitude. But Akbar's whole life was spent in humiliating, insulting, massacring and fleecing his subjects. As such he cannot be deemed to be even a naturalized or domiciled citizen. His mere physical residence in India is no criterion for identifying him as an Indian. If a gang of dacoits successfully defies the residents of a village aud continues to plunder them by using some village dwellings as their base of operation can they be deemed to be residents of that village? If an intruder occupies two rooms of a house and kidnaps the house-owner's daughters can he be deemed to be the son-in-law in residence of his victim-host? Likewise India was an unwilling victim-host to Akbar and his descendants. Till the very end none of them ever considered India as their home or Hindus as their bretheren. They always regarded Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria,

Afghanisthan and Abyssinia as their father-lands, Mecca and Medina as their shrines and the majority of the Indians as their dire enemies. They considered massacring of the Hindus and the ravaging of their homes as their pious duty. Could those who sported such ideals and ideologies be ever regarded as Indians even though they had made India their home? Making India their home or operating base made matters worse. They could thereby perpetuate their depredations with greater ease from closer quarters and as an incessant routine. It is not, therefore, physical presence or length of residence in a country which is the soul of citizenship but love for the soil, affection for the people and dedication to the service of both. Far from having any of these qualities Akbar was a menace to India and Indians from every aspect and his death was regarded as a good riddance not only by the people at large but by Akbar's own son Jehangir and by all his courtiers.

Since Akbar was not an Indian it is no wonder that he subjugated Indian rulers with ruthless cruelty and systematic relentlessness. Vincent Smith says[2] "In reality a more aggressive king never existed. The ruling passion of Akbar was ambition. His whole reign was dedicated to conquest...His attacks were aimed at destroying the independence of every state...The people of Gondwana were happier under Rani Durgawati than under Asif Khan (Akbar's general)." Contrary opinions expressed by Malleson and Von Noer, Smith dismisses as "untrue" and "nonsense."

2. P. 251, ibid.

"Akbar's[3] lust for dominion was never satisfied. He longed with intense fervour to extend his rule over all the nations and kingdoms lying within the range of his sword."

"[4]It is not necessary to adduce any particular incident as supplying a motive for the attack on Rana (Pratap), who is represented by Abul Fazal (Akbar's self-appointed court chronicler) as deserving of chastisement by reason of his alleged arrogance, presumption, disobedience, deceit, and dissimulation. His patriotism was his offence... The campaign of 1576 was intended to destroy the Rana, and crush finally his pretensions to stand outside of the empire. The emperor desired the death of the Rana and the absorption of his territory. The Rana while fully prepared to sacrifice his life if necessary, was resolved that his blood should never be contaminated by admixture with that of the foreigner, and that his country should remain a land of free men. After much tribulation he succeeded and Akbar failed."

"[5]Asaf Khan (I), governor of Kara and the eastern provinces, having subdued the Raja of Panna in Bundelkhand was directed by Akbar to turn his armies against Gondwana. The country was then (in 1564) governed by a gallant lady Rani Durgawati, who 15 years previously had become regent for her minor son. Although he had now attained manhood, and was recognized as the lawful Raja she continued to rule the kingdom. The Rani was a princess of the famous Chandel dynasty of Mahoba, which had been one of the great powers of India 500 years ago. Her impoverished father had been obliged to lower his pride and give his daughter to the wealthy Gond Raja, far inferior in social position. She proved worthy of her noble ancestry and governed her adopted country with courage and capacity 'doing great things' as Abul Fazal remarks, 'by dint of far-seeing abilities. (She fought battles) with Baz Bahadur and Mianas, and was always victorious. She had 20,000 good cavalry with her in battles and 1,000 famous elephants. The treasures of the Rajas of those countries fell into her hands. She was a good shot with gun and arrow, and continually went a-hunting and shot animals of the chase with her gun. It was her custom that when she heard that a tiger had made his appearance, she did not drink water till she had shot him. She carried out many useful public works in different parts of the kingdom and deservedly won the hearts of her people. Her name is still remembered and revered. Akbar's attack on a princess of a character so noble was mere aggression, wholly unprovoked and devoid of all justification other than the lust of conquest and plunder. Mrs. Beveridge is quite right when she declares that Akbar was 'a strong and stout annexationist before whose sun the modest star of Lord Dalhousie pales...Having men and money he went to work and took tract after tract' (A. S. Beveridge, in von Noer, vol. 1, p. vii)....

"Akbar would have laughed at the remorse

3. P. 160, ibid.
4. Pp. 106-8, ibid.
5. Pp. 59,51, ibid.

felt by Asoka for the miseries caused by the conquest of Kalinga, and would have utterly condemned his great predecessor's decision to abstain from all further wars of aggression."

Smith dismisses as "sentimental rubbish" Count von Noer's belief that Akbar's conquests were intended to achieve the great goal of welding the lesser states into a great empire. Smith adds[6] "Akbar's annexations were the result of ordinary kingly ambition supported by adequate power. The attack, devoid of moral justification, on the excellent government of Rani Durgawati was made on the principle which determined the subsequent annexations of Kashmir, Ahmednagar and other kingdoms. Akbar felt no scruples about initiating a war, and once he had begun a quarrel he hit hard and without mercy. His proceedings were much the same as those of other able, ambitious and ruthless kings."

Akbar's entire reign is a horror drama of his barbaric hordes haunting, chasing and hacking down one principality after another to slake his thirst for despotic power over as large a portion of the earth as possible.

Immediately after his general, Sharfuddin had completed his assignment of compelling Bharmal the ruler of the Jaipur (Amber) kingdom to swallow his Rajput pride and surrender his daughter to the harem of the alien Muslim, Akbar put him on the job to reduce Merta (in the former Jodhpur State) another stronghold of Hindu freedom.

6. P. 51 ibid.

Akbar's intolerance of any limitations on his own despotism may be seen in his treacherous overthrow of his own loyal guardian Behram Khan. He even went to the extent of having Behram Khan murdered. To add insult to injury he usurped Behram Khan's wife and made Behram Khan's young child subservient to himself.

Baz Bahadur, the ruler of Malwa, was subdued and forced to serve as an ordinary subaltern in Akbar's armies.

Rani Durgawati's kingdom was overrun. She committed suicide on the battlefield, while her sister and daughter-in-law were dragged to Akbar's harem.

Rana Pratap, the immortal hero who made his mother's milk resplendent by his dogged resistance to Akbar's repeated attacks and who kept the flag of Hindudom flying in the face of relentless Muslim onslaughts was many-a-time reduced to desperation and destitution just because Akbar's lust for reducing everybody to abject submission was unquenchable.

The principalities which were hacked by Akbar's imperial sword in an incessant orgy of mass massacres, plunder, rape, arson, ravage, woman-lifting, carrying away of men into slavery, and desecration of temples to be turned into mosques, included Chittor, Ranthambhor, Kalinjar, Gujerat, Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Kashmir Khandesh, Ahmednagar, Asheergadh, Banswada, Dongarpur, Bikaner, Jodhpur, Jaisalmer, Sirohi, Kabul, Nagarkot and Boondi.

An indication of the sexual and monetary tribute that Akbar used to extract from subdued chieftains may be had from the terms of the treaty concluded with Rai Surjan Hada, chief of Boondi. This ruler was made to surrender fort Ranthambhor by coaxing and cajoling him into submission. He could therefore ask for some special exemptions. These terms were[7]: 1. The chiefs of Boondi should be exempted from that custom degrading to a Rajput, of sending a dola to the royal harem. 2. Exemption from the Jiziya or poll tax. 3. The chiefs of Boondi should not be compelled to cross the Attock. 4. The vassals of Boondi should be exempted from sending their wives or female relatives to hold a stall in the Meena Bazar at the palace on the festival of Noroza. 5. They should have the privilege of entering the Diwan-i-Am completely armed. 6. Their sacred edifices should be respected. 7. They should never be placed under the command of a Hindu leader. 8. Their horses should not be branded, with the imperial dagh. 9. They should be allowed to beat the naqqaras or kettle drums in the streets of the capital as far as the Lal Darwaja and that they should not be commanded to make the prostration on entering the presence. 10. Boondi should be to the Hadas what Delhi was to the king who should guarantee them from any change of capital.

Analysing the above conditions is very revealing. The first condition shows that Akbar used to

7. Pp. 382-383, Vol. II, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, by Col. Tod, ibid.

coerce vanquished leaders to send their women to his harem. If the vanquished leaders were Mohammedans all their harem women had automatically to join the victor's harem. If the vanquished foe was a Hindu, Akbar and his predecessors and successors made him surrender choice women of his family to the imperial Muslim harem. This was greatly resented by the Hindu chiefs because there was a world of difference between the kind of life they led and the Muslims led. While Muslim life used to be steeped in murder, massacre, treachery, plots and counterplots, opium and drug-addiction, drunken revelries and illiterate barbarism the Hindu chiefs used to lead a holy, clean, god-fearing life.

Indian historians have been tutored to believe that the Dola system was a marriage. It was far from that. It was a blatant usurpation and kidnapping under duress. That is why it was all completed within a day. The term 'Dola' though singular must not be interpreted to signify only one palanquin with only one woman seated in it. It was used as a collective noun indicating that the Muslim victor could dictate to the vanquished as to which women he would have for himself, his sons and courtiers. It would be a travesty of truth to call this heart-rending abduction anything akin to a holy marriage where a woman is graciously given and respectfully received. She is given all protection and honour. She is allowed freedom and sumptuous allowances. Hindu women taken to Muslim harems were for ever silenced in the curtained off recesses. Their voice was for ever stilled. They were not even

permitted generally ever to visit their parental homes or to retain any connections with their erstwhile Hindu relatives. In a harem teeming with conqured women they could hardly expect to receive even a square meal much less toilet facilities. Recently even in our own times the pitiable condition of the late Nizam's harem women came to light. Their plight was so desperate that they would not get even a thimblefull of oil for their hairdo which used to be infested with lice. In most cases they continued to be hated and looked upon with contempt by the other harem colleagues, by the Muslim sovereign and by his retinue Sometimes they were also murdered and poisoned as happened in the case of Jehangir's wife Manbai the Jaipur princess. Even her own brothers' high position at Akbar's court could be of no avail to save her life. Many-a-time women in the sovereign's harem used to be gifted away to other Muslim courtiers as vehicles for their amour as is evidenced by European accounts of Akbar's time. All talk, therefore, of Akbar having forged marital relations with Hindu chieftains for a lofty and laudable purpose is baseless.

The second condition of the Ranthambhor treaty reveals that the notion that Akbar had abolished the hateful Jiziya tax is false. We shall see later that every important Hindu personage coming to Akbar's court had to beg for remission of the Jiziya tax . In each case Akbar is stated to have ostensibly ordered a magnanimous exemption. But his orders were not meant to be carried out. They were meant, even if the few recorded instances of

the sanction of such exemption be true, just to please the visitor and send him apparently contented outside the court. When his back was turned who bothered. It is doubtful whether Boondi citizens and the chieftain himself remained exempt for long from the Jiziya. Because it often happened that conditions agreed to by the Muslims were usually only to effect a subjugation. Once the subjugation was accomplished the conditions were all thrown overboard and the vanquished soon found themselves reduced to utter servitude.

The exemption asked from compulsion to cross the Indus (at Attock) is often inerpreted as Hindu reluctance or orthodox objection to leave the boundaries of Hindusthan. This is a misinterpretation. Hindu religion not only puts no restriction on crossing the boundaries of the country, it positively encourages and demands conquests of its brave sons – the Kshatriyas. The Boondi chief's demand of exemption from being made to go beyond India's borders was to ensure that he did not become a pawn and a slave for Muslim conquests in distant regions only to strengthen their domain and stranglehold on Hindusthan. Moreover, a Hindu chieftain did not want to lose his life to enhance Muslim prowess, in a distant land. Even if he expected to come back alive he was not sure that on return his women, children and other relatives would be safe. Mahabat Khan an erstwhile Rajput though a Muslim convert found that while he was fighting in Kabul for Jehangir his wives and children were summarily turned out of their residence because accommoda-

tion had to be found for Prince Parwez. Afraid of such highhandedness and abduction and pillage a Hindu chieftain was averse to leaving his family and serving in a distant place for a Muslim. In going to distant Muslim countries with Muslim armies he also ran the risk of being himself converted to Islam under duress and threats of torture. For all such reasons Hindus disliked crossing the Indus as henchmen of Muslims.

The condition that Boondi chieftains be exempted from sending their women to the Meena Bazar proves that all courtiers and chieftains subservient to Akbar were compelled to send their most beautiful wives, daughters and sisters to that annual festival where Akbar was free to play with their chastity and womanly virtue.

The condition that Boondi chiefs be allowed to enter the royal palace fully armed indicates that Hindus were disarmed while entering Muslim palace precincts. This entailed the risk of the Hindus being treacherously pounced upon and murdered or held prisoner or hostage and made to agree to degrading conditions. In Muslim history such cases were very frequent.

The stipulation that the sacred edifices of the Boondi kingdom may not be desecrated clearly shows that during Akbar's times Hindu religious shrines and temples used to be freely turned into mosques or Muslim serais or stables or brothels. When Badayuni complains that Akbar turned mosques into stables or appointed Hindu doorkeepers he only means that the Hindu mansions

and temples which Muslim troops turned into mosques in the first flush of victory were later put to different Muslim uses. As a practical and ambitious monarch Akbar could not tolerate all captured Hindu buildings being turned into mosques. He wanted them for other use. Historians have misunderstood and misinterpreted this particular remark of Badayuni. As a fanatic Muslim he desired that most captured buildings, especially Hindu temples and shrines should automatically be used as mosques. Akbar could not allow lofty Hindu temples and mansions to be all converted into mosques when he needed them for other temporal use. Akbar was as fanatic a Muslim as Badayuni. He would never dream of converting any erstwhile genuine mosque into a serai or brothel.

The Boondi demand that their horses should not be branded with the royal mark shows that every citizen who owned a horse was made to have his horse branded with the imperial mark. This was a very hateful practice. It at once reduced each single individual to royal serfdom. In times of war, and wars were endemic during Muslim rule in India, every individual who owned a branded horse could be coerced and forced to die fighting for the alien Muslim monarch. This ancient Muslim practice was continued by Akbar with his own special vigour and rigour. Thus branding a horse amounted vistually to branding every man as a slave of the court.

The demand that Boondi chiefs be allowed to beat their drums to announce their approach to the

palace was to ensure that their royal privileges were not snatched away.

The stipulation that Boondi ought to continue to be their capital was to ensure that they won't be uprooted from their ancient moorings where they commanded respect and allegiance from their own subjects, into totally strange surroundings where they would soon be reduced to total serfdom of and dependence on the Muslim sovereign.

If the Ranthambhor treaty is thus intelligently analyzed it reveals the various ingenious ways in which even during Akbar's times all vanquished chiefs were in no time reduced to non-entities so that the Muslim monarch could make free use of Hindu women, wealth and territory. Akbar's conquests were, therefore, not meant to weld India into one kingdom or nation but to subjugate everybody to his despotic rule. Vincent Smith's remark that[8] "Akbar's annexations were the result of kingly ambition supported by adequate power" is apt and displays real historical acumen, talent and insight.

8. P. 51, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Chapter IX

THE PLUNDR ECONOMY

Books on mediaeval Indian history often contain elaborate descriptions of what they call the revenue administration of rulers like Raziya, Allauddin Khilji, Ferozshah Tughlak, Sher Shah or Akbar. All such descriptions are fictitious. They are either based on genuine misunderstanding or are motivated communal propaganda. They are all attempts to bypass the truth, and reveal a mentality which does not have the courage to face and express the stark truth.

Without exception the reign of every Muslim ruler in India from Mohammad bin Kasim onwards until the end of Mogul rule in 1858 A.D. had no revenue administration as such. Theirs were all plunder economies based on multiple usurious and spurious taxes, bribes in cash and kind at every stage, confiscations, acquisitions of all his property on the death of any noble even if he had heirs, and frequent military swoops for organized dacoity and plunder under imperial auspices.

A revenue system to be valid, legal and respectable presupposes that the revenues are used for public welfare : to provide essential services, to ensure security for the citizen, and to maintain peace and order. It also presupposes that taxes and other levies are based on some principles such as a certain percentage of incomes, fixed periods at which such taxes are to be paid, and provision of

judicial remedies if anyone is unjustly taxed. None of these criteria ever governed the extortions under Muslim rule, which pass for revenue administrations.

That such usurious conditions should exist under Muslim rule was inevitable considering human nature. It could not have been otherwise. Because the rulers and their retinues were not answerable to the local people and they had no love for the country's soil. They deemed themselves to be answerable only to the Koran. They all looked upon Mecca and Medina as their poles. They hated the Indian people. They never called them Hindus. They always referred to the local people with some invective like infidels, scoundrels, slaves, thieves, reptiles and robbers. When this was their ordinary outlook is it not plausible that they regarded the Hindus to be fit only to be mulcted and squeezed? Indian histories have fought shy of admitting this truth.

Another point worth considering is that in the accounts of Muslim reigns we find the sovereign always engaged in incessant warfare against his own kith and kin, against rebellious generals and against the Hindus. This warfare involved the plunder and ravage of the local population by both the contenders and at times several contenders as happened in the case of Dara, Shuja, Aurangzeb and Murad fighting against one another. Such regimes could sustain themselves only by plunder.

Fanciful accounts of Muslim rulers or invaders like Akbar, Ferozshah Tughlak, Sher Shah or

Tamerlain having built serais and roads all along highways at short distances are absolutely baseless. They are descriptions plagiarized from what India's own Kshatriya rulers used to do for their people. If all the claims of ruler after Muslim ruler having established serais, charitable homes and resting places were true we should have found almost an unbroken series of such buildings on both sides of all highways. But there is not even one such. Even the trees which earlier Hindu rulers had planted to make highways shady and comfortable for the traveller were uprooted for the invaders' need for fuel, boats, staffs, scaffolding, ladders, mangonels and other uses.

Paper-setters and examiners in Indian mediaeval history, therefore, do great disservice to the cause of truth, to the student community and to the lay public in asking the students to write about the so-called reforms, public welfare schemes, revenue administrations or principles of administration of a Jehangir, Akbar, Sher Shah, Mohammad Tughlak or Ferozshah. They would do better if instead they asked students to write about how Shivaji and Rana Pratap ruled their kingdoms despite the ravage caused by incessant Muslim onslaughts; how they marshalled their resources and won the love and respect of their people despite their having been constrained to ask their people to sacrifice more and more in defence of the motherland during a millenium of chaos and rampage caused by alien invaders. History teachers and scholars can ask such questions in good conscience only about indigenous Hindu rulers.

Akbar is supposed to be the best of the lot. So if we prove that even his administration was based on nothing but systematic plunder of his subjects we shall have dealt a death blow to the notion that Muslim regimes in India had even a semblance of an administration or that they were concerned about public welfare.

Even a fanatic Muslim chronicler like Badayuni who was in the pay of Akbar says[1] "The emperor (Akbar) made Mulla Mujdi of Sirhind (formerly) warrant-writer to Islim Shah, the Receiver-General of revenues And Samsher Khan he made Superintendent of the Exchequer. And these through the vileness of their birth...perpetrated all sorts of oppression and tyranny...and so annoyed the soldiery that they compelled Masum Khan to revolt."

In the above passage the word "revenues" is to be understood to mean the amounts extorted with terror and torture under all sorts of pretexts or by regular military raids on the populace.

Badayuni also observes[2] "In this year (A.H. 987) Qazi Ali of Baghdad who had been appointed in spite of Sheikh Abdun Nabi to look into the administration of Madad-i-Maash lands, and their encroachment brought these holders of land grants to court and cut off most of their lands and left them precious little."

Recounting how Abdun Nabi was arraigned on a false charge of withholding an amount which had

1. P. 274, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle.
2. Pp. 282-83, ibid.

been given to him for the pilgrimage to Mecca Badayuni says[3] "Sheikh Abdun Nabi came to Fathpur and made use of some rude language. The emperor was unable to restrain his passion and struck him in the face. Then with a view to make him settle his account of about Rs. 7,000 which the emperor had given him when he set off for Mecca he was handed over as prisoner to Raja Todarmal and for some time like a defaulting tax-gatherer, they imprisoned him in the counting house of the office, and one night a mob strangled him."

"In 990 A.H." "[4]says Badayuni "Sayyid Mir Fath Ullah...came to Fathpur. He was honoured with the post of Sadar whose only duty was erasure, in order that he might confiscate the lands of the poor."

In 991 A.H. Akbar[5] "issued a general order that every person from the highest to the lowest should bring him a present."

[6] In the year 982 A. H. Akbar "gave orders that the holders of grant lands should not be let off by the Kroris of each pargana unless they brought the firmans in which their grants, subsistence allowances and pensions were described, to the Sadar for inspection and verification. For this a large number of people from the extreme east of India to as far west as Bhakkar (on the Indus) came to court. If any of them had a powerful protector

3. P. 321, ibid.
4. P. 325 ibid.
5. P. 332, ibid.
6. P. 207, ibid.

in one of the Amirs or near friends of His Majesty, he could manage to get his affair settled, but (others) had to bribe Sayyad Abdur Rasul, the Sheikh's head man, or make presents to his chamberlains, door keepers and sweepers in order to get their blanket out of the mire. Unless, however, they had strong recommendations or had recourse to bribery, they were utterly ruined. Many of the Ainahs (land grant holders) without obtaining their object died from the heat caused by the crowding of multitudes. Though a report of this came to the ears of His Majesty, no one dared to take these unfortunate people before the emperor."

[7]"All the parganas of the country whether dry or irrigated, whether in towns or hills, in deserts and jungles, by rivers, reservoirs or wells were all to be measured and every such piece of land as upon cultivation would produce one crore of Tankas was to be divided off and placed under the charge of an officer to be called Krori. Security was taken from each one of these officers...A great portion of the country was laid waste through the rapacity of the Kroris, the wives and children of the subjects were sold and scattered abroad and everything was thrown into confusion. But the Kroris were brought to account by Raja Todarmal, and many good men died from the severe beatings which were administered, and from the tortures of the rack and pincers. So many died from the protracted confinement in the prisons of the revenue authorities, that there was no need of the executioner or swordsman, and no one cared

7. P. 192 ibid.

to find them graves or grave cloth—The whole country with the exception of those lands held immediately from the crown, was held by the Amirs as jagir, and as they were wicked and rebellious and spent large sums on their stores and workshops and amassed wealth, they had no lesiure to look after the troops or take interest in the people. In some cases of emergency they came themselves with some of their slaves and 'Mogul attendants to the scene of war but of really useful soldiers there were none."

Carefully analysed the above passage reveals that the much vaunted revenue system invented by the stooge of a Todarmal for his overlord Akbar, was a most ruthless machinery for extracting the last farthing from the people at the peril of floggings and torturous death, requiring them to sell their wives and childern. This is what is lauded in Indian histories as a wonderful revenue administration of Todarmal, and is sought to be rapturously waxed upon by history students, scholars and professors. No knowledge of history is required to debunk the claim that it was a wonderfully public welfare-oriented scheme. Had it been so it would have been adopted by a free India immediately after British rule lapsed. This is sheer logic. Moreover an alien monarch gulping one Hindu kingdom after another by waging ruthless wars was not itching to usher a very magnanimous administration. Indian history that is being taught in schools and colleges in India and other parts of the world, thus makes nonsense of all logic. It also benumbs the thinking power of readers of history, and reduces history to absurdities.

The basic high-handedness of this sinister scheme was that all land in the domain of Akbar, whether fallow, irrigated, unirrigated, desert, fertile, rocky, mountainous, eroded, ravine or occupied by a stream, river or lake was divided into standard pieces of uniform acre-age. This itself was atrocious.

To add to the gall of such a division was the assumption that each of those areas must yield to the crown one crore rupees revenue. Whether it actually yielded that much even to the cultivator or owner Akbar didn't brother. Moreover it must be realized that a cultivator could remit one crore rupees as annual revenue only if he made at least four crores. To expect him to produce that much whatever the quality of land and through famine or drought was another very sinister assumption.

The third sinister aspect of the scheme was that middle-men extortionists called Kroris (because they were supposed to procure for the crown a crore rupees each as revenue) had been appoined to tap that much amount from the public at any cost. This completely shut off the peasantry from the crown. The latter was not concerned with the state of the land or its crop. The administration extracted one crore rupees as revenue from every Krori. Naturally the Krori must extract at least Rs. 2 crore to be able to pay one crore to the crown under all eventualities and to save a substantial amount as his own wages. Thus what was ostensibly one crore rupees revenue turned out to be in actual practice a levy of at least two crore rupees per annum. One can well imagine this burden when it is realized that even the one crore revenue yield per plot of

all types of land was an atrocious assumption. On top of that to devise a system of extortion which would compel the cultivator to part with at least Rs. 2 crore was the very limit of cruelty. To part with Rs. 2 crore per year the cultivator would have to realize at least Rs. 8 crore from his holding. Whether he could earn even a fraction of that amount is doubtful.

In extorting one crore rupees for the crown per plot the Krori had to maintain a band of hoodlums who could mulct two crores from the citizenry. In the alternative the barbarous soldiery of the crown was put at the disposal of the Krori to help him extort that much amount.

The last sinister characteristic was that the amount once fixed was screwed out of a tormented public with extreme severity which broke up homes and families either by torture to death or by being scattered for sale as slaves.

A more demonaic system couldn't exist anywhere in the world. And yet Akbar is atrociously hoisted as an ideal monarch—a virtual demi-god.

Todarmal was deeply hated for permitting himself to be an imperial stooge, and setting up this devilish system based on every inch of ground and every person in the domain. It is no wonder therefore that there is at least one attempt to assassinate him, on record.

When Gujerat was conquered Todarmal was promptly despatched thither to quickly introduce the same extortionist system there. That such a system was introduced immediately after that pro-

vince had been ravaged and impoverished by two barbaric Muslim armies contending to overpower each other, underlines the extreme cruelty of the imposition. Todarmal was presented a sword by Akbar "when Todarmal brought with him a clean balance sheet of the accounts of Gujerat"[8] says Badayuni. The clean balance sheet means that the crown was reimbursed to the last pie and perhaps also given a large profit for its devastating campaign of unabashed conquest and plunder of Gujerat.

Such atrocious regimes could obviously be sustained only by liberally parcelling out the plundered money to the barbarians extracting it lest they turn against the sovereign himself. Under Muslim rule, therefore, it was all a plunder to squander economy, leaving the crown always almost bankrupt. In Akbar's case it is said that at least on one occasion[9] when he asked his treasurer to produce Rs. 18 the latter couldn't produce even that paltry sum.

Vincent Smith observes[10] "Abul Fazal as usual attributes much virtue to the reform. Badayuni, on the other hand, gives on account quite different and presumably nearer the truth than Abul Fazal's courtly phrases. I fear it is true that the new system of revenue administration must be regarded as a grievous failure resulting in shocking oppression of the helpless peasantry and cruel punishment of the local oppressors. The ordinary histories

8. P. 174, ibid.
9. P. 45, footnote, Vincent Smith's "Akbar the Great Mogul."
10. Pp. 99-100, ibid.

lavish so much praise on the revenue reform effected by Akbar and Todarmal and on the merits of the imperial administration generally, that it is startling to read a criticism so severe (as Badayuni's). Although Badayuni had his personal grievances against both Akbar and Todarmal, and was embittered by the most rancorous bigotry, it is not possible, I think, to disregard his testimony in this matter as being merely the malicious invention of a disappointed courtier and exasperated fanatic. He may be fairly described in those terms but his statements of fact, when they can be checked from other sources, seem to be usually correct."

Vincent Smith is slightly mistaken in calling the system a failure becasue it resulted in so much cruelty. The fact on the other hand was that it was a signal success because its very purpose was to extract the utmost from the populace at any cost, which it did with ruthless efficiency.

Dr. Shrivastava observes[11]. "After his momentous success (against Uzbeks, June 9, 1567, when Bahadur and Khan Zaman had been captured and put to death under elephant's feet) Akbar paid a visit to Allahabad and thence went to Banaras, which was plundered as the people of the city had the audacity to close their gates against the emperor. From Banaras he went to Jaunpur and thence to Kara Manikpur weeding out principal partisans of the Uzbeks."

We have seen earlier that the people of Deosa and other towns in Rajasthan had fled in Akbar's

11. Pp. 108-10, Akbar, the Great, vol.1, ibid.

wake. Now we see that residents of Banaras (and Allahabad) also barricading themselves against Akbar's advent. This is enough to indicate that wherever Akbar went his barbaric hordes spread terror raping women, looting homes, desecrating Hindu shrines, burning buildings and plundering the population. Why else will the people barricade or flee their homes. The populace usually goes out of its way to pay homage to even common place or slightly tyrannical sovereigns. People are generally prone to welcome royalty and consider it a great honour. If then people fled in terror from Akbar it is clear that they regarded him worse than a horde of man-eaters. This in itself is enough indication that far from being a noble monarch and a great man, Akbar was one of the worst tyrants of history. Even if there had been no other evidence in history about Akbar's tyranny except the two sentences noting how people took to flight or shut themselves up in their homes trembling in terror, that is enough proof of his being the world's most cruel monarch. It is a wonder and pity that literary mushrooms should sprout wild in India in the name of profound histories or treatises ironically praising a sadist Akbar sky high as though he was an archangel.

After killing Durgawati in battle[12] "Asaf Khan (Akbar's general in the aggression against Rani Durgawati) proceeded to Chouragadh, and took it by storm. The Rani's son was trodden to death. Independently of the jewels, the images of gold and silver and other valuables, no fewer than a 100 jars of gold coins also fell into the hands of the con-

12. Pp. 133-144 vol. II, Ferishta's chronicle, ibid

queror. Of all this booty Asaf Khan presented to the king only a small part and of a 1000 elephants, which he took, he sent only 300 indifferent animals to the king, and none of the jewels."

In what way did Akbar's aggressive attacks on Hindu and Muslim kingdoms differ from ordinary dacoities except in their gigantic scale backed by imperial might ! While gangs of dacoits swoop on ordinary homes Abkar's terror-force swooped on rich kingdoms. The treasures he plundered throughout his life from the citizenry in general and from rich kings, queens and the aristocracy, makes the Arabian Nights treasures in tales like 'Alibaba and the Forty Thieves' pale into insignificance.

THE CHAOTIC ADMINISTRATION

There was no administration as such to talk of during Akbar's reign. It was a free-for-all and like a style of wrestling "catch as catch can" was the general rule. It was a melee of lawlessness, whimsicalities, sadistic tortures, cruelties, unending aggressive wars, interminable revolts, plunder campaigns conducted by Akbar himself on his own subjects, mass conversions, extortions under duress, massacres, corruption and bribery, woman-lifting, dacoity and robbery on highways, desecration of Hindu shrines and murders galore even in the environs of Akbar's court.

Vincent Smith notes[1] "The whole administration was absolutely personal despotic, directed to the stringent collection of a heavy assessment, the provision of numerous military forces, and the maintenance of imperfect public order in a rough and ready fashion under the sanction of ferocious punishments inflicted arbitrarily by local despots. The penalties in ordinary use included impalement, trampling by elephants, beheading, amputation of the right hand and severe flogging. But there was no effective law to hinder the infliction of many other cruel forms of punishment according to the caprice of the official . . ."

[2]"The history of India in the Muhammedan

1. P. 277. Akbar the great Mogul, ibid.
2. P 279, ibid.

period must necessarily be a chronicle of kings, courts and conquests, rather than of national and social evolution."

[3]"When we try to picture the effect of (Akbar's) qualities on the people whom he conquered and governed, and seek to decide whether or not they were happier or prosperous under his rule than under that of many other despots. . . . it is not easy to draw even an outline sketch. The record is painfully defective. We hardly hear anything definite in the histories about the common people or their mode of life. Information about the actual working of the revenue administration, a matter all important to the Indian peasant is almost wholly lacking, and the record of the state of education, agriculture and commerce is extremely meagre."

In view of his remarks mentioned above we wonder on what grounds did Vincent Smith title his book as "Akbar, the Great Mogul". On what grounds does he use the adjective 'great'?

As Smith aptly notes there is no record to show that Akbar's rule was public-welfare-oriented. Had his rule been really enlightened as is superficially claimed there would have been immense evidence.

On the other hand it is our view that hoodwinked by the hullabaloo of Akbar's presumed 'greatness' raised by a long line of court flatterers, communalists and history-writers even discerning writers like Smith confine themselves merely to a

3. P. 280, ibid.

negative assertion that there is no evidence to prove that the people of the country benefitted from Akbar's rule. We quite agree that there is not an iota of evidence to that effect. But what about the overwhelming evidence that Abkar's was a sadistic, torturous, murderous and plundersome regime? This evidence would not have escaped the notice of history writers and teachers had they not been reduced to a state of hypnotic slumber and insensitivity by the hue and cry about Akbar's so-called greatness.

[4]"The whole framework of the government was military. A local governor was not bound by any rules of either substantive law or procedure. He was the representative of the imperial autocrat and as such could do much as he pleased within his jurisdiction. Ordinarily the subjects had to make the best of the treatment which their local rulers thought fit to give them. The officers who did not much embezzle were few."

"[5]Abul Fazal admits that 'throughout the whole extent of Hindusthan, where at all times so many enlightened monarchs have reigned one-sixth of the produce was exacted; in the Turkish empire, Iran and Turan—a fifth, a sixth and 10th respectively.' But Akbar asked for one-third i.e. to say, double the Indian and Persian proportion. Abul Fazal seems to think that the abolition of a host of miscellaneous cesses and imposts justified the doubling of the government share of the pro-

4. Pp. 267-268, ibid.
5. Pp. 274-275, ibid.

duce. But it is impossible to doubt that in practice many of those imposts and cesses continued to be collected, and as Oldham drily remarks in a note, 'most, if not all, of these taxes were subsequently revived.' . . . The assessment unquestionably was severe . . . Cases of hardship must have been numerous. . ."

The fanatic and discriminatory nature of Akbar's rule is at once bared by the above remarks. While in Muslim lands the sovereign took as little as a 10th of the farm produce in India Akbar extorted a third part. He was sworn to reduce Hindus to destitution as a fanatic Muslim.

[6]"The horrid punishment of mutilation, which is prescribed by the Koran, was used freely. . . . Neither Akbar nor Abul Fazal had any regard for the judicial formalities of oaths and witnesses. . . The Faujdar was expected to reduce rebels, always numerous, and whenever necessary to use his troops against recalcitrant villagers in order to enforce payment of government dues.

Historians are often prone to swear by Abul Fazal's Ain-i-Akbari to eulogise Akbar's reign as very enlightened. Vincent Smith rightly cautions such gullible writers and teachers of history that the Ain-i-Akbari is a tissue of lies. He observes [7]"A reader glancing hastily at the Ain-i-Akbari or 'Institutes of Akbar', and seeing the elaborate statistical tables. . . .might suppose (that the) work contains ample material for an economic history or description of the country under his master.

6. P. 276, ibid.
7. Pp. 280-86, ibid.

But closer study will soon dispel the illusion. The important subject of 'Regulation regarding Education,' (Book ii, Ain 25), for instance, is dismissed with a few perfunctory words intimating that the boys should be taught reading and writing. . . The section is closed by the baseless assertion that 'these regulations shed a new light on schools, and cast a bright lustre over Muslim schools. The curriculum recommended obviously has no relation to the facts. No school in India or elsewhere has ever attempted to work such a programme. The author simply desired to lay another morsel of flattery at the altar of Akbar's shrine."

Historians would do well to heed those wise words. The Ain-i-Akbar from beginning to end, is an imaginative account. The whole chronicle was manufactured by the flatterer of an Abul Fazal at his desk as the wrote it from day to day. He quotes no authorities and his observations are all self-contradictory and confusing.

[8]"The only remedies available to the orthodox against the impious or latitudinarian king were rebellion (when he disregarded Koranic precepts) or assassination, both operations being extremely dangerous to attempt. A really strong king could defy Koranic law as far as he thought fit. Akbar did so in greater or less degree throughout most of his reign, and carried his defiance to the utmost lengths during the last 23 years of his life. His action endangered his throne in 1581 but when he had surmounted that crisis he was able for the rest

8. Pp. 259- 263, ibid.

of his time to do what he pleased. A monarch in such a position lay under no obligation to have a council of ministers at all. . . . Nothing required the autocrat to maintain any particular number of ministers or to have a council of any particular form. . . Late in the reign (the) officers numbered about 1600. . . . Their appointment, retention, promotion and dismissal depended solely on the arbitrary will of the sovereign. The emperor regarded himself as the heir of all his subjects and ruthlessly seized the entire property of every deceased official whose family had to make a fresh start contingent on the goodwill of the emperor."

[9]"The systematic assessment of the empire for which Akbar and Todarmal are given so much credit was primarily intended to increase the imperial revenue. Akbar was a hard-headed man of business, not a sentimental philanthropist, and his whole policy was directed principally to the acquisition of power and riches. All the arrangements about jagirs, branding, etc. were devised for the one purpose namely, the enhancement of the power, glory and riches of the crown. We do not know anything substantial about the actual effect of his administrative measures on the welfare and happiness of the common people. Certainly they did not prevent the occurrences of one of the most terrible famines on record which desolated northern India late in the reign, from 1595 to 1598. The enormous hoards (of treasure that Akbar had collected and kept in six cities) then lay idle in the treasure vaults."

9. Pp. 253-255, ibid.

10"All office-holders, as a rule, did their best to cheat the government."

11"It must be clearly understood that the actual execution of the imperial orders was extremely imperfect from first to last, all sorts of evasions and frauds being continually practised with considerable success. Akbar was well aware that he must wink at a good deal of attempted deception."

Smith's observation above is fully justified. It, however, needs a little amplification. Akbar was ruthless enough not to wink where his own interests were involved. His 'winking' at the non-compliance of some orders was a sheer make-believe. As the supreme pontiff of a cruel and wicked system there was a tacit understanding between Akbar and his henchmen that he would pass certain orders for mere window-dressing, to throw like a tempting dry crumb at the Hindus but that those orders were not meant to be carried out.

Dr. Shrivastava notes that "Akbar appointed an eunuch named Bahlul Malik, Diwan of reserved (crown) lands, exalting him to the title of Aitimad Khan. The emperor sanctioned new rules for the collection of revenues which were enforced sometime in September 1562. Unfortunately no indication is given by any contemporary writers regarding these new regulations. Abul Fazal contents himself by saying that 'the revenues which were the foundation of sovereignty and the basis of the dominion, and the source of military strength,

10. P. 265, ibid.
11. P. 102, ibid.

were put upon (a proper) footing.' Badayuni adds that great economy, unknown before, was effected in expenditure."

The 'new' revenue rules are a clear hoax since none of the contemporary writers mention what they were. While Dr. Shrivastva bewails of the "unfortunate" lapse of contemporary writers it is most unfortunate that he himself gullibly believes in such a hoax. If rules are said to have been framed but court historians are silent as to what they were the conclusion is clear that no rules were made. On the other hand the reference to economies proves that the new system enforced by the eunuch of an Aitimad Khan was to tighten the noose of repression, oppression and extortion round the necks of subjects and at the same time introduce the greatest thrift where the question of rewarding or compensating anyone for his services arose.

That those fancied regulations were new methods of imperial robbery leading to the impoverishment of the helpless subjects is borne out by a footnote by Blochmann. He says[12] "Akbar after the death of Shamsuddin Mohammad Atgah Khan, his foster father, commenced to look into matters of finance, and finding the revenue department a den of thieves, he appointed Itimad Khan to remodel the finances. In 1565, he conveyed the daughter of Miran Mubarak, king of Khandesh (1535-1566) to Akbar's harem. When in 1578

12. P.13, Ain-i-Akbari by Abul Fazal Allami, translated from the original Persian by H. Blochmann, Bibliotheca Indica series, Calcutta.

Akbar's presence was required in the Punjab Itimad Khan desired to join him. In order to equip his contingent, he collected his rents and outstandings, as it appears, with much harshness. This led to a conspiracy against his life. In the same year he was murdered by Maqsud Ali."

When we find that each one of Akbar's so-called revenue-administrators were sought to be murdered (since Todarmal too was sought to be murdered) the cruelty and repression of their levies and the torturous nature of their extortions may well be imagined. In the case of Itimad Khan what could one expect from a mere eunuch who roped in royal princesses for Akbar's harem as though they were cattle for the slaughter house. Todarmal too carried out similar functions. So these so-called revenue ministers turn out to be procurers of women for Akbar. When they could stoop so low as to be imperial panders what kind of revenue regulations can one expect from them!

An instance of what kind of men or rather eunuchs used to be in Akbar's confidance is graphically described by Abul Fazal himself. He says [13]"Shah Quli Mahram-Baharalu was passionately attached to a dancing boy of the name Qabul Khan, and as the emperor had the boy forcibly removed, Shah Quli dressed as a Jogi went into the forests. Behram traced him with much trouble and brought him back where the boy was restored to him. . . . The emperor from goodwill towards him, admitted him to his female apartments. After the first

13. P. 387, ibid.

time he had been allowed to enter the harem, he went home and had his testicles removed. Mahram means one admitted to the harem. He died at Agra in 1010 A.H. At Narnaul where he chiefly lived he erected many splendid buildings and dug large tanks."

Akbar's court reeked with such eunuchs and sodomites who were given despotic authority over helpless subjects. It is also clear that Shah Quli must have mishaved in the tempting harem and therefore was compelled by Akbar to have his testicles removed. Who would otherwise volunteer to have his testicles removed especially if he is as lecherous as Shah Quli. The reader may also note the building bluff. How could a mean, cringing, indigent eunuch build splendid buildings and dig wells in Narnaul! This graphically illustrates how earlier Hindu buildings and wells have been unashamedly ascribed to one or other Muslim.

An idea of the worthless men through whom Akbar carried on his disreputable administration may be had from another instance noted by Abul Fazal. He tells us [14]"Ismail Quli Khan brother of Khan Jahan kept 1200 women and was so jealous that whenever he went to court, he put his seal over the strings attached to their night drawers. Resenting this and other annoyances they made a conspiracy and poisoned him."

Describing the stabbing of Itimad Khan, Abul Fazal says [15]"Maqsud Ali who killed Itimad Khan

14. P. 388, ibid.
15. P. 473, ibid.

is said to have been blind in one eye. When he explained to Itimad his miserable condition, his master retorted by saying 'someone should put urine' in his blind eyes. (Infuriated by this remark) Maqsud stabbed him on the spot. According to another account he was stabbed by Maqsud while getting up from the bed.'' The filthy language that Akbar's courtiers used and the despicable circumstances of their death throw a lurid light on the tyranny, torture and moral degradation that formed the foundation of Akbar's rule. It is also significant that no one took any notice of even courtiers' murders. How else can the different versions of Itimad Khan's death in his own house or in the court, be explained. It hardly mattered to anybody if such mean men were murdered. In fact all rejoiced at the good riddance because every courtier was a tyrant for his harem women, his prolific progeny and his subordinates.

Blochmann quotes a footnote from page 290 of Tarikh-i-Firozshahi to illustrate the status of Hindus under Muslim rule. The note says[16] "When the collector of the Diwan asks them (the Hindus) to pay the tax, they must pay it with all humility and submission. And if the collector wishes to spit into their mouths, they should open their mouths without the slightest fear of contamination so that the collector may do so. In this state (with their mouths wide open) they should stand before the collector. The object of such humiliation and spitting into their mouths is to prove the obedience of infidel subjects under

16. P. 247, ibid.

protection, and to promote the glory of Islam, the true religion, and to show contempt to false religions. God himself orders us to despise them, for he says (Sur. 9.29) 'out of hand while they are reduced low'. To treat the Hindu contemptuously is a religious duty, because they are the greatest enemies of Mustafa (Mohammad) because Mustafa, regarding the killing and plundering of Hindus, and making slaves of them, has ordered (that) they must either accept Islam or be killed, or be made slaves, and their property must be plundered. . . .''

Royal Muslim practice of admitting men to own harems only after castration or rendering them impotent seems to have been widely practised, since Abul Fazal describing Itimad Khan of Gujerat tells us that [17]"He was originally a Hindu, servant of Sultan Mahmud, King of Gujerat. Being trusted by his master he was allowed to enter the harem. It is said from gratitude, he used to eat camphor, and thus rendered himself impotent.''

There are many contradictions in the above passage. If the sultan trusted Itimad Khan and allowed him into the harem, the question of his rendering himself impotent should not have arisen. If the intention was that he should consort with some harem beauties as a special favour of the monarch, impotency was a disqualification. If it was a question of appointing him for some supervisory duties, who would put a man in charge of a teeming and tempting harem when women could

17. P. 418, ibid.

be safely appointed. This only proves that Muslim sovereigns used to castrate or otherwise emasculate individuals whose misfortune it was to be chosen to superintend the harem. In this respect too Akbar was no better than other Muslim sovereigns. Incidentally it may also be noted how adverse inferences emerge from fraudulent, flattering Muslim chronicles, which try to twist the truth in favour of their base patrons and to the detrement of the wronged individual.

In the list of grandees at Akbar's court Abul Fazal lists Jagannath, son of Raja Bihara Mull of Jiapur, as the 69th grandee, adding that [18]"he was an hostage in the hands of Sharfuddin (grandee, No. 17)." We have already seen earlier that Bihara Mull agreed to surrender the virtue and chastity of his daughter gulping his Rajput pride because three princes namely Raj Singh, Jagannath and Khangar had been held hostage by Akbar's General Sharfuddin on paid of torturous death, at Sambhar, unless Bihara Mull agreed to humble himself by surrendering his daughter for the royal harem and in addition pay a huge ransom. This shameful transaction has been unashamedly described by all historians as a rare honour that Akbar did by condescending to marry a Hindu princess out of lofty motives of communal integration, friendship, amity, understanding, etc. etc. It need not be added, therefore, that Akbar's other marriages too, even with Muslim girls, were blatant abductions.

All the above details should convince the reader that Akbar's was one of the most atrocious and chaotic rule in world history.

18. P. 421, Ain-i-Akbari, ibid.

Chapter XI

AKBAR'S MILITARY

Like his civil administration Akbar's military too was a loose band of barbaric hooligans who used to be collected in teeming swarms at the beat of the drum and later let loose uncared for. The soldiery used to be worked up to a feverish fanatic pitch by their commanders when an attack was imminent on an adversary. The generals and their troopers perpetrated horrid barbarities and sent heads of dreaded decapitated opponents as veritable bouquets for Akbar's delight, or the slaughtered heads and bodies used to be piled up in tall towers for the delight and self-congratulations of the soldiery for the rich toll they had taken of the enemy.

Thus in addition to Akbar's revenue officials loose bands of army stragglers, deserters, part time employees, rebels, imposters, pseudo-fakirs, cheats, robbers, dacoits, and hoodlums used to be on rampage throughout Akbar's rule tormenting the public, desecrating their shrines, looting their wealth, kidnapping their women and converting them to Islam under dire threats.

Vincent Smith observes[1] "Akbar's military organization was intrinsically weak, although it was far better than that of his happy-go-lucky neighbours. His army would not have stood for a moment against the better kinds of European troops. Whenever his officers ventured to attack the Por-

1. Pp. 265-66, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

tuguese settlements they failed disastrously. Alexander the Great would have made short work of Akbar's mightiest host...If Akbar had the misfortune to encounter the Maratha light horse it is possible that he might not have fared much better than his great grandson did. Akbar's military administration had in it the seeds of decay and failure."

Smith quotes Akbar to say that [2]"a monarch should be ever intent on conquest." That being Akbar's slogan it is no wonder that by hook or crook he humbled everybody on whom he could throw his military net.

The army's slogan was to kill any Hindu even if he was fighting on Akbar's side, because a Hindu killed was considered a gain for Islam. The chronicler Badayuni who was himself a soldier in Akbar's army which battled with Rana Pratap in the famous field of Haldighat, reveals this when he says[3]...."I asked the commander Asaf Khan-II (he is different from Asaf Khan-I who fought against Rani Durgawati) as to how to distinguish foe from friend when the Rajputs on our side had got mixed up with the Rajputs in the enemy's army and was assured in reply that I could do no wrong even if I shot anywhere because on whichever side they may be killed it will be a gain to Islam."

By quoting his own example Badayuni typifies how every soldier of Akbar's army thirsted for the blood of the Hindus. Badayuni says[4] "In 984 A.H.

2. P. 251, ibid.
3. P. 237, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.
4. Pp. 233-34, ibid.

the emperor ordered Mansingh to proceed to the hostile district of Kokanda and Kumalmer (the region ruled by Rana Kika alias Rana Pratap). Ardour for fighting against the infidels kindled in my breast. I applied to the emperor through Nakib Khan. At first he (Nakib Khan) made objections, and said: 'If a Hindu (i.e. Mansingh) had not been the leader of this army, I should myself have been the first to have asked permission to join it!' I represented (on getting an audience with Akbar) that I had a very strong desire to take part in a holy war (i. e. wanton massacre of Hindus). I have the presumption to desire to dye these black mustachios and beard in blood through loyalty to Your Majesty's person...and when I put out my hand towards the couch in order to kiss his foot, he withdrew it; but just as I was going out of the audience chamber he called me back, and filling both his hands presented me with a sum of 50 Ashrafis and bid me farewell...

[5]"War was declared because Rana Kika had refused to send his royal elephnat to Akbar as a mark of submission."

This atrocious demand of Akbar wanting Rana Pratap to surrender his elephant just for nothing except the whim of Akbar to humble him, was the thin end of the wedge. If that had been conceded demands of a huge ransom, personal prostration and surrendering of the beauties of his family and of his courtiers' families for Akbar's harem would have inevitably followed.

Describing how Rana Pratap battered and

5. P. 235, ibid.

shattered the Muslim army Badayuni tells us that even in their cowardly flight Akbar's soldiers used to justify their action with reference to prophet Mohammad. Badayuni says[6] "Kazi Khan (wounded in his thumb) being no longer able to hold his own, recited the saying 'flight from overwhelming odds is one of the traditions of the prophet' and followed his men (in their retreat)...

"Mansingh exhibited such intrepidity as surpasses all imagination. And that day through the generalship of Mansingh the meaning of this fine line of Mulla Shiri became known :—'A Hindu wields the sword of Islam'."

Badayuni describes how when he[7] "returned to Fatehpur Sikri with Rana Pratap's elephant the emperor was exceedingly pleased and putting forth his hand to a heap of Ashrafis presented me 96 Ashrafis."

Badayuni's account goes to indicate that no training, discipline or drill was needed in Akbar's time to join his army. All and sundry Muslims who thirsted to attain salvation by taking part in the massacre of Hindus, and such Hindus as were ready to abet that slaughter could merrily pull out their own bows and arrows, spears and swords, hatchets and staffs and sally out for unbridled rampage, as easily as a woodcutter slinging an axe on his shoulder goes out to the forest to hack wood.

Dr. Shrivastava notes that the[7] "Mugal army plundered Dungarpur territory when its Sisodia

6. Pp. 243-47, ibid.
7. P. 145, Akbar the Great, Vol. 1, ibid.

ruler Askaran refused to break with Rana Pratap."

Akbar used to compel prominent and influential persons to be his recruiting agents and virtual contractors to produce army contingents at a moment's notice. Dr. Shrivastava describes how[8] people were compelled to maintain a fixed number of horses, camels, elephants etc. and bring them for inspection at fixed periods.

Akbar was a sadist, since according to the chronicler Ferishta[9] Akbar undertook the conquest of the Deccan as a diversion being grieved on the death of his son Murad Mirza. Ferishta says "Prince Murad Mirza falling dangerously ill (May 1599) was buried at Shapoor. The corpse was afterwards removed to Agra, and laid by the side of Humayun, the prince's grandfather. The King's grief for the death of his son increased his desire for conquering the Deccan, as a means of diverting his mind."

The above passage is revealing in two respects. It gives us an insight into Akbar's cruel nature which sought to drown his grief over the death of his son in the flood of the blood of the rulers and the populace of the Deccan.

Secondly it exposes the hoax of the so-called Humayun tomb in Delhi. If according to Ferishta Humayun lies buried in Agra and his grandson Murad is buried there alongside, his fancied tomb in Delhi is a fake just intended to keep a Hindu mansion falling into Hindu hands because of the

8. Pp 177-78, ibid.
9. Pp. 170-71, Vol. II Ferishta's chronicle.

Hindus' pathetic fear of desecrating a tomb. A similar instance of a fake grave in Bhairaich in Uttar Pradesh has been brought to light in the article[10] titled विजय तीर्थ के दर्शन in which the writer Mr. Biharilal Shastri points out how the fancied tomb of Salar Masud the nephew of Mohammad Ghazni in Bhairich, is a usurped ancient Hindu temple called Baladitya. Salar Mahmud running away from the field of battle pursued by king Suheldev climbed a tree where he was surprised and killed. Sometime later when that region came under Muslim occupation the Baladitya Hindu shrine was desecrated by burying some Muslims in it and renaming it as Balay Miya's tomb.

Father Monserrate, a Jesuit priest who was at Akbar's court from March 4, 1580 to April 1582 contrasts Hindu administration with Muslim administration saying[11] "Brachmanae (Brahmins i.e. Hindus) govern liberally through a senate and council of the common people; but the Musalmans have no council or senators, everything being decided by the arbitrary will of the governor appointed by the king."

[12]"The roads were infested on all sides by robbers. Musalmans are easily induced to put Christians (and Hindus of course) to death."

Monserrate tells us how Akbar held some prominent individuals responsible to provide him military contingents whenever required. These grandees in turn used to assign that quota to a number of underlings and thus it was carried on down the line through what turned out to be a graded system of contractors and sub-contractors charged with providing troops just for the emperor's asking at a moment's notice. If anyone failed to carry out the emperor's order he was tortured to death, his kith and kin were sold as slaves or taken hostage and his property was confiscated. Under duress, therefore, each individual was ultimately coerced into joining the army and present himself for military duty equipping himself many a time, at his own cost.

Monserrate says[13] "There are 45,000 cavalry, 5,000 elephants and many thousand infantry, paid directly from the royal treasury. In addition to these there are troops whose command is inherited by their chief officers from father to son, like an hereditary estate; these troops consisting of cavalry, infantry and elephant detachments, are paid by their commanding officers out of the revenues of the provinces which they hold from the king...The government of such (conquered) territories is vested in nobles on condition that they pay some stated tribute to the royal treasury. These nobles distributed in their turn cities, townships and villages. The king grants each noble a district large enough to enable him to maintain due state and dignity to support properly his share of the military forces..... The cities and lands in the empire belong to the king and the whole army obeys him as comman-

10. P. 7 of the Hindi weekly सार्वदेशिक dated April 14, 1968, Sarvadeshik Pratinidhi Sabha. Ramlila ground, New Delhi.
11. P. 219, Monserrate's 'Commentarius."
12. P. 186, ibid.

13. Pp. 89-90, ibid.

der-in-chief, yet most of the troops have their own generals and officers to whom they are attached by an hereditary allegiance. This fact supplies constant cause and opportunity for conspiracy and treason."

Akbar's armies sustained themselves by plundering the regions which they traversed. Such plunder was brought in from day-to-day and the loot was sold at a cheap price to the soldiery. The Commentarius notes [14] "The army began to advance on February 8, 1581 (in the campaign against Mirza Hakim). For the first few days the army seemed remarkably small. However, it increased so rapidly that it soon seemed to hide the earth. It extended over the breadth of a mile and half covering the fields and filling the woods with a crowding multitude. The priest (Monserrate who was with the army) was astonished (because he was unaware that it was procured under duress by open plunder to be sold to Akbar's hordes at a price) by the cheapness of the grain amongst so great a multitude, especially considering the number of elephants. This was achieved by the careful skill and foresight of the king himself. For he despatched agents chosen for their diligence, to the neighbouring cities and towns with instructions to bring in provisions from all sides and he announced to the merchants (who were rounded up by a fierce soldiery) who brought grain, maize, pulse and all manner of provisions and other merchandise into the camp, that if they would sell at cheap rates he would exempt them from imposts and taxes. (This is not as innocuous

14. Pp. 77-80, ibid.

as it looks because it was a direct threat. They knew how Akbar used to mulct people for his taxes—by flogging and making them sell their wives and children. If they did not sell their goods at throwaway prices Akbar knew how to terrorize and torture them to extract from them their earnings on the pretext of recovering all sorts of bogus levies). When he advanced beyond the frontiers of his empire (i.e. when Akbar was an aggressor) the king's foresight and carefulness was seen in the way in which he sent heralds to announce to the inhabitants of the country (in such a way that news of the announcement may be carried far and wide), that no one would be harmed or deported who did not take up arms, that, if they would bring supplies to the camp they should be made to pay no imposts, but should be free to sell as they liked...But that if they disobeyed him they would be heavily punished. All of them terrified as they were by his huge army there were no high prices and no lack of provisions even in a hostile country."

Monserrate's testimony proves how Akbar's army collected the merchants under dire threats and made them part with their wares at ludicrous prices. It can well be imagined that under such circumstances goods could even be freely looted. The few transactions which did take place at cheap prices were mere and sheer exceptions. Thus even while the army was engaged in a campaign Akbar had it pay its own way. People were also forced by conversion or by dire threats to join the army and invade neighbouring regions. Those forced to join in their turn plundered the regions through

which they passed, from sheer necessity to satisfy their needs, now that they were torn from their homes, families, native moorings, their culture, religion and friends. They were thus turned into worst criminals overnight from the peaceful, law-abiding and god-fearing citizens they had been only a day before.

In accounts of Akbar's reign one often comes across terms like Do Hazari and Pach Hazari. They never meant that the persons concerned commanded that many troops. The terms conferred, on the individuals so honoured, a certain status allowing him entry to the court and a right to stand in rows assigned to those ranks. The status was also accompanied with land grants suitable to the rank, which made the recipients virtual sovereigns in the areas allotted to them. Blochmann cautions the reader that[15] "A commander of 5,000 was not necessarily at the head of a contingent of 5,000... Contingents of Mansabdars, which formed the greater part of the army, were mustered at stated times and paid from the general or local treasuries. Akbar had much trouble with these musters as faudulent practices were quite common."

Badayuni referring to the utter chaos and tyranny at such musters says[16] "The whole country with the exception of Khalisa (crown) lands was held by the Amirs as jagir; and as they were wicked and rebellious, and spent large sums on their stores and workshops, and amassed wealth, they had no

15. Pp. 251-352, Ain-i-Akbari, ibid.
16. P. 190, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

leisure to look after the troops or take interest in the people. In cases of emergency, they came themselves with some of their slaves and Mogul attendants to the scene of the war; but really useful soldiers there were none...The Amirs put most of their own servants and mounted attendants into the soldiers' clothes....When a new emergency arose, they mustered as many 'borrowed' soldiers as were required...Hence while the income and expenditure of the Mansabdar remained in status quo dust fell into the platter of the helpless soldier so much so that he was no longer fit for anything."

What greater indictment could there be than the above of the utter misery of the life of the common man during Akbar's rule, whether he was a soldier or a civilian.

Justice Shelat rightly observes that[17] "Notwithstanding the several striking conquests that Akbar achieved, the army under him cannot by any means be called efficient."

Akbar's and in fact other Muslims' success in India was due to the ruthless methods of total war that they adopted. Among Hindus when one king invaded the other's domain they did not harm the pupulace. The two armies met face to face and decided the issue in open combat. The Muslim invader had an altogether different and savage approach. Muslim armies used to be on the rampage all along the way. Thus before they reached the citadel of their victim they used to burn all homsesteads, occupy all temples and turn them

17. P. 327, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat, ibid.

into mosques, enslave entire townships and force the people to help the army by undertaking menial duties, acting as guides or bringing provisions, massacre multitudes, convert thousands and as neo-converts force them to fight for Islam against their own erstwhile compatriots. Such forcible and ruthless methods of recruitment swelled the ranks of the Muslim invaders while at the same time leaving none who would help the Hindu garrison with supplies. The Hindu garrison waiting inside the city walls or fortress found that the people in the entire region outside, who constituted their very kith and kin had been converted to Islam, all their property was looted, their homesteads were burnt, their women and children were kidnapped and their shrines were converted into mosques. Thus even before the soldier was called upon to fight he found that there was nothing left to fight for. If any spirit was still left in him after witnessing this colossal mischief there was practically no one left who would bring him provisions. That starved him into a desperate last ditch stand or surrender. In addition the enemy's ranks swelled out of all proportions through military service forced on multitudes of neo-converts. It was these ruthless methods which led to the inroad of Muslim invaders into Hindusthan. Readers of Indian history who do not ponder on this often wonder what made mighty Hindu rulers and their devoted armies knuckle under the undisciplined hordes of the alien Muslims. Given these methods of total war any invading force could bring its victims to submission. Had the Hindus retaliated with like measures tooth for tooth and eye for eye

by readily accepting back into their fold Hindu converts to Islam, by converting the invading Muslims themselves to Hinduism, massacring whole multitudes and burning all their belongings their was no reason why they should not have succeeded in putting a stop to Muslim invasions. But the Hindus like the Bourbons neither learnt anything from their enemies nor forgot any of their orthodox practices. Far from converting any of the alien invaders the Hindus in their orthodoxy wouldn't even admit their own forcibly converted co-religionists back into Hinduism. This made the neo-converts more bitter and they swore to wreak vengeance on their erstwhile co-religionists. All these factors led to the subjugation of Hindusthan by the Muslims. And yet it must be recorded to the glory of the Hindus, their fighting spirit, their morale, and their bravery that in spite of such heavy odds and self-imposed handicaps they waged a fight against wave after wave of invasions for 1,000 long years. This feat is unparalleled in world history. All other regions from Africa to Indonesia which came under the rampant and rampaging Muslim sword were reduced to complete submission and conversion while Hinduism did flourish after its millenium of travail and trial, in the form of the resurgent Rajput, Maratha and Sikh forces.

History has, therefore, a lesson that in times of war the side which resiles from retaliating tit for tat cannot escape enslavement.

Chapter XII

TAXES

It would be wrong to imagine that Akbar had any fixed system of taxation namely specific levies at specific times. This holds good for the entire 1,000-year-long Muslim rule in India. Even if there was a semblance of any such they were lost in a maze and haze of additional and arbitrary ad hoc extortions made at will by officials or imposters and impersonators under dire threats. Even the usual levies would more often than not be increased considerably at the whim and mood of the official concerned. Sometimes while the Muslims could get themselves exonerated partly or wholly by bribing the partisan officials or by appealing to their sense of Islamic fraternity, that loss was made good by higher extortions from Hindus. At times even a wily or cringing Hindu could also avoid payment of the taxes in whole or part by humouring or bribing the tax-collector. But such instances were very rare and at times they entailed considerable loss of property and honour to the Hindu subject inasmuch as he had even to bribe the officials by providing them with some hapless women for their harems.

When armies were on the march there was no limit to these extortions. Though the extortions may have been described as taxation they were little short of wholesale plunder. It is also on record that whenever Akbar wanted to repair the

Red Fort at Agra (since the notion that he built it is baseless) or the town wall of Agra or the ancient Hindu township of Fatehpur Sikri (which again was not built by Akbar) he used to impose additional levies on the subjects. Thus the poor subjects were made to sustain a regime which kidnapped their women, sold them as slaves, usurped their shrines and plundered their property day in and day out. By no stretch of imagination could such extortions be exactly commensurate with the cost estimates of the repair work. The amounts extorted under pretext of carrying out repairs to usurped Hindu townships and buildings were usually much in excess of the most liberal estimates for actual repairs plus generous embezzlement.

It is against such a background that Akbar's so-called tax-system must be studied. First and foremost was the hated Jiziya. Eversince Muslim invaders set foot on Indian soil from about the beginning of the 8th century they imposed on the Hindus living in the territories under their control a heavy levy called the Jiziya which was extracted with much cruelty. The levy was based on the doctrine that since the sovereign was a Muslim his kingdom was a Muslim kingdom. All those who were non-Muslims were suffered to live by the Muslim sovereign only if they agreed to pay a heavy tax for the sustenance of a hostile Muslim stranglehold. This tax was considered to be very atrocious because it was based on an ironical paradox. The Hindus were supposed to pay the Jiziya through their nose for the 'protection' (sic) which

a Muslim sovereign 'graciously' (sic) provided for them lest he exercise his religious prerogative to massacre them en masse. But actually the 'protection' was a fiction. The Hindus were all along subjected to humiliations, extortions, massacre, torture, kidnapping of their women and children burning and breaking up of their homes, and wholesale plunder. To add insult to injury they were made to pay for being allowed just to 'live' to be mulcted.

This obnoxious levy is described by both of Akbar's chroniclers Badayuni and Abul Fazal as having been magnanimously abolished by Akbar because of his fancied greater tolerance of Hindus. European writers and other evidence indicate that Akbar continued to extract the Jiziya with traditional severity and rigour.

We have already noticed earlier that in the treaty of Ranthambhor Rai Surjan the Hindu ruler of Bundi felt the need to ask for exemption from the Jiziya as a special concession and favour. Had the Jiziya been abolished he would not have mentioned it.

Dr. Srivastava describing the Jain monk Hirvijaya Suri's stay at Akbar's court (from June 7, 1583 for two years) notes that[1] "Akbar issued orders confirming the abolition of the Jiziya and the pilgrims' tax both for the Hindus and Jains in Gujerat and Kathiawar... When (another Jain divine) Shanti (came to court) in 1587, Akbar granted him a farman, again confirming the abolition of the Jiziya and prohibiting animal slaughter."

1. P. 265, Akbar the Great, ibid,

The above passage needs closer examination. The words "issued orders confirming abolition of Jiziya" clearly mean that the original order, if any, was a dead letter and the Jiziya continued to be extorted. Had a decree been really issued abolishing the Jiziya Akbar was ruthless enough to have seen that it was carried out. So the conclusion is that Akbar never ordered the abolition of the Jiziya. Mentions to the contrary in Muslim chronicles must be dismissed as mere fulsome flattery and window-dressing to project the fancied magnanimity of Akbar towards the Hindus who formed a vast majority of his subjects. Had Akbar really passed that decree Hirvijay Suri would not have been given any "confirmation." Even after that "confirmation" was given it couldn't have stopped the extraction of the Jiziya when even the imaginary original decree did not work. Again the other Jain monk Shantivijaya who visited Akbar's court in 1587 (i.e. two years after Hirvijaya's departure) is again handed a royal order "again confirming the abolition of the Jiziya and also an animal-slaughter-ban" thrown in for good measure.

The hypocrisy and dishonesty of these so-called abolitions and bans should be immediately apparent to the reader from the above passage. Even if Akbar passed any such orders they were never meant to be carried out. They were only a courtly make-believe, an empty formality intended for the gullible to swallow and to send the distraught visitor apparently happy at the deceptively persuasive 'magnanimity' of the emperor only to find to his chagrin on return to his own province that Akbar's

feigned order was never taken seriously by any member of his administration. It didn't make the least difference to the collectors of the Jiziya.

Justice J.M. Shelat observes[2] "In theory Islamic jurisprudence does not recognize a non-Muslim as a citizen of the state. The Muslim jurists, therefore, gave such subjects a qualified status by imposing certain disabilities and fines for being suffered to exist in the state... In India the problem was accentuated by the fact that the non-Muslim population formed an overwhelming majority. Since it was impossible to destroy such a vast number of subjects, the ruling class subjected them to several inequities and disqualifications, thus easing their conscience... There were laws of blasphemy which subjected the non-Muslims··· to the whims of the Mullas.. The bigoted manner in which some of the Mullas applied the laws of blasphemy is illustrated by the case of Bodhan a Brahmin of Kaithan, who was beheaded during the reign of Sikandar Lodi for a mere assertion that Hinduism and Islam were both real.. The Jiziya was a heavy tax. The next was the pilgrim tax. Since even the village fairs were taxed, this impost seems to have been almost universal. Though the payment of these taxes was intended to ensure free exercise of religion to non-Muslims, the freedom was nonetheless, limited to private worship.. The Hindus were not allowed to build new temples or even to repair old ones...

"When fresh territory was conquered, there

2. Pp. 183-89, Akbar, by J.M. Shelat, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1967.

would be a wave of destruction of temples as Jagannath Puri was destroyed by Ferozeshah Tughlaq. Even in peaceful times, a ruler like Sikandar Lodi in a spurt of frenzied religiosity would desecrate and destory temples and salve his fanaticism...

"Babur confined the stamp duty to the Hindus alone. One of his chiefs Hindu Beg converted a temple at Sambal into a mosque. Sheikh Zain, his Sadar, desecrated a great many temples at Chanderi. In 1528-29 Mir Baqi destroyed a famous temple at Ayodhya under his orders and built a mosque in its place (Sri Ram Sharma's 'Religious Policies of the Mogul Emperors,' P 9).

"Sher Shah's attack on Maldeo of Jodhpur was partly political and partly due to a desire to convert the temples there into mosques. A temple converted by him into a mosque is still extant in Jodhpur known as Sher Shahi mosque. His treachery towards Puranmal was explained as undertaken to exterminate an infidel His successor Islam Shah brought the state under the complete domination of the Mullas... (Akbar's) commander Bayazid converted an ancient temple at Benaras into a mosque."

Smith also calls off the bluff of the abolition of the Jiziya, by remarking in a footnote[3] "The mention of the abolition of the Jiziya and the pilgrim tax at the instance of the Suri and his disciple proves that the general orders issued in the reign for the cessation of those imposts had not been fully obeyed."

3. Pp. 120-21, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

We would like to amplify Smith's understanding of the case. The so-called orders were a mere make-believe and were never intended to be complied with according to a tacit understanding between Akbar and his officials. Secondly Smith's remark that "they were never fully carried out" is not justified. The orders remained unimplemented in their totality.

About the other taxes Smith notes[4] that "Abul Fazal is rather obscure in his description, because he seems to say that 'a tenth of the total of ten years was fixed as the annual assessment,' and then to state that as regards the last five years of the period above-named the superior crops were taken into account in each year, and the year of the most abundant harvest accepted'. 'If the best year was taken as the standard, the assessment must have been severe." The reader must not, therefore, place any credence in Muslim chronicles. Their statements were intended to be mere court flattery, and before they are accepted at their face value they should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. Usually their assertions themselves contain enough contradictions and vague, tortuous, anomalous statements which should shatter their claims.

Mr. Shelat observes[5] "The upper strata of the administration was on the Turko-Persian model." (That shows how it was alien). "The peasants were generally antipathic to the collector mainly because they derived no benefit from the state. Even the functions of the police had to be per-

4. Pp. 135-36, ibid.
5. P. 315-17, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat, ibid.

formed by the villagers themselves. They also felt that the old system of assessment, the Batai system was advantageous to them inasmuch as they could pay a part of the actual rather than anticipated harvest. The local revenue officers were on the whole greedy and corrupt and were not slow in exacting all sorts of unauthorized imposts from the farmer. Their corruption found its roots in the pernicious custom, which prevailed throughout the Mogul period of offering costly presents to the ruler and the higher officers, who in their turn took presents from their subordinate staff... Bribery still flourished on a large scale."

Dr. Shrivastava says[6] "At the beginning of 1587 Akbar promulgated an ordinance according to which everyone who was presented at court had to contribute according to his circumstances, as many dams or rupees or mohurs (gold coins) as he was old in years." This again was an atrocious levy. It effectively discouraged anyone from approaching the sovereign with complaints of torture, tyranny or extortion. Because such a visit entailed paying another tax for a royal audience. Even after such a call all that the visitor could expect, if Akbar was in a good mood, at best, was to come back armed with a deceptive order of the exemption sought after, which no official took seriously. When, therefore, Dr. Shrivastava quotes Abul Fazal's Akbarnama (Vol. III, pp. 490-94 and 533-34) that the levy was spent on wells, reservoirs, serais, gardens and other works for the benefit of the public, we cannot help wondering at the pathetic gullibility of writers like

6. Pp. 354-57, Akbar the Great, ibid.

him whose writings have substituted factual history by wishful accounts.

Badayuni says[7] "In accordance with established custom Akbar is weighed twice a year, on his solar and lunar birthdays against gold, silver and other precious things which are given to the Brahmins of Hind and to others." This is a typical piece showing how Muslim chroniclers bedecked the cruel regimes of their patrons with the frills of enlightened Hindu rule. It was the Hindu monarchs who had themselves weighed against precious metals and treasure to distribute that to the Brahmins and the indigent. How could a Muslim sovereign who extracted the Jiziya to allow the Hindus just to exist, ever commit the sacrilege of distributing to them a largesse. All that is to be understood, from the above custom, is that this was yet another cruel levy. Far from giving anything to the Hindus Akbar expected them to contribute treasure equal to his weight at least twice a year. This treasure was obviously appropriated to the royal treasury. Another conclusion from Badayuni's vague statement, could be that at least twice a year Akbar had himself weighed first in gold, then in silver, then in other precious things (i.e. gems). One may well imagine how much he earned at least twice a year by this stratagem.

"[8]In 971", says Badayuni "the project of building the fortress of Agra was conceived, and its citadel which had before been of bricks, he had built of hewn stone and he ordered a tax of three

7. P. 85, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.
8. P. 74, ibid.

seers of corn on every jarib of land in the district." Thus even for such works Akbar called for special taxes in addition to the usual extortions. How could such a monarch spend anything on public welfare. The above statement also exposes how historian after gullible historian has been led to believe that Akbar constructed Agra Fort. Badayuni clearly states that the utmost that Akbar did was to provide a stone pitching to the wall surrounding Agra fort and Agra town. That stone pitching too, if any, was done at public cost. But in our view even the claim of stone pitching is false. What Akbar sought as a pretext for levying another usurious tax was some minor repairs to the fort and town wall.

Badayuni specifically states[9] "At this time (983 A.H.) Sheikh Abdun Nabi and Makhdum-ul-Mulk were ordered to examine and decide the amount of tax to be levied on Hindus, and firmans were issued in all directions". This gives the lie to the usual claim that Akbar made no discrimination against the Hindus. It also proves that far from passing any orders abolishing any discriminatory taxes Akbar took care to issue specific orders "in all directions" to see that there was no laxity or doubt about the extractions to be obtained from Hindus exclusively with all severity.

"[10]No son or daughter of the common people was to be married until they had gone to the office of the chief of police, and been seen by his agents, and the correct age of both parties had been in-

9. P. 213, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid
10. P. 405, ibid.

vestigated. In this way a host of profits and perquisites surpassing all computation, guess or imagination, found their way into the pocket of those in office, especially certain police officers and effete Khanlings and other vile oppressors."

This was a marriage tax. But besides the money part of it, which itself was a great burden on the populace, the manner of extraction of it exposed Akbar's Hindu subjects to illimitable indignity, dishonour, humiliation and immorality. The reference to the determination of age of the parties to the marriage could mean a nude medical examination and appraisal by profane and corrupt officials. It could also have led to the abduction of handsome girls and boys for prostitution or sodomy. Obtaining permission for a marriage from a corrupt and lecherous administration obviously meant heavily bribing them with perhaps women for prostitution and wealth and costly presents.

A review of Akbar's taxation policy, therefore, shows that any excuse was good enough for him to mulct his subjects. These included repairs to fortifications, marriage tax, Jiziya, pilgrim tax, court-audience-tax, weighing-the-sovereign tax, wholesale confiscations of all property of any subject dying, military campaign-tax, and open plunder. This too does not speak of any greatness in Akbar. On the other hand it only confirms that he was one of the most tyrannical monarchs in world history.

GREED

In spite of his very large domain, arbitrary and usurious levies and wholesale plunder, Akbar's phenomenal greed for money led him to various other ingenious modes of collecting money.

Akbar used to earn money by selling as slaves prisoners taken after a battle or raid. Badayuni recounts that around 989 A. H.[1] "the emperor captured a sect of Sheikhs, who called themselves 'disciples'. His Majesty asked them whether they repented of their vanities. At his command they were sent to Bhakkar and Qandahar and were given to merchants to exchange for Turkish colts."

Akbar also earned money by confiscation of the property of his deceased subjects. Badayuni illustrates it by pointing out that[2] "Makhdum-ul-Mulk died at Ahmedabad and in the year 990 Qazi Ali was sent from Fathpur to ascertain what property he had left. Several boxes full of ingots of gold were discovered in his sepulchre where he had caused them to be buried as corpses. And the wealth which lay open to the eyes of the world was such as none but the creator could ascertain. All these ingots of gold were placed in the public treasury. His sons after being some time on the rack of distress fell at last into the most abject poverty."

1. P. 308, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.
2. P. 321, ibid.

Akbar also issued[3] a "general order that every person from the highest to the lowest should bring him a present."

[4]"In A. H. 999 Sheikh Ibrahim Chisti (brother of Sheikh Salim Chisti) died at Fathpur. A sum of 25 crore of ready money together with elephants and horses and other chattels were appropriated by the imperial treasury and the remainder became the portion of his enemies who were his sons and his agents. And since he was noted and notorious for avarice and vice was accursed "base of disposition and vile Sheikh."

[5]"Shahbaz Khan Kambu kept in confinement for three years had paid a fine (ransom) of seven lacs of rupees, was set free and appointed to manage the affairs of Malwa and be vakil to Mirza Shahrukh."

Thus a prisoner could overnight become a governor. And since Akbar knew that such governors made enough money by usury and extortion in the regions assigned to them, he took the precaution of extracting a huge sum in advance. In addition he naturally expected the usual costly presents and the annual tribute.

Akbar did not spare even his own mother's property from confiscation. Smith notes[6] "Akbar's mother only 15 years older than him died on or about August 29, 1604. Her body was taken to

3. Pp. 332-3, ibid
4. P. 387, ibid.
5. Pp. 401-2, ibid.
6. Pp. 229-30, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Delhi and laid by the side of her husband (Humayun) whom she had outlived by 48 years. (This gives a lie to the notion that Akbar and other Muslims used to build lofty and palatial tombs. All those who died were buried in usurped Hindu mansions and temples). The deceased left in her house a large treasure and a will directing that it should be divided among her male descendants. Akbar was too fond of money to withstand the tempting annexation of her wealth, the whole of which he appropriated without regard to the terms of the will (Footnote, Du Jarric, iii, 118)."

[7]"He was rather penurious and retentive of money," says Monserrate.

Though an emperor possessing fabulous treasure and the power to ask for anything[8] "Akbar himself was a trader and did not disdain to earn commercial profit."

[9]"He also derives much revenue from the hoarded fortunes of the great nobles, which by law and custom all come to the king, on their owners' death. In addition there are spoils of conquered kings and chieftains whose treasure is seized, and the great levies exacted, and gifts received from the inhabitants of the newly subdued districts in every part of his dominions. These gifts and levies are so large as to ruin outright many of his new subjects. He also engages in trading on his own account and thus increases his wealth to no small

7. P. 252, ibid.
8. P. 298, ibid.
9. Pp. 207-209, Monserrate's Commentarius, ibid.

degree, for he eagerly exploits every source of profit. Moreover he allows no bankers or money changers in his empire. The enormous banking business (of the royal treasuries) brings the king great profit. The government officers are paid in gold, silver or copper according to their rank. Thus it comes about that those who are paid in one type of coin need to change some of it into another. Such means of increasing wealth may be thought base (but nothing was too base for Akbar) There is a law also that no horse may be sold without the king's knowledge or that of his agents. Zeladinus (i. e. Jalaluddin Akbar) is sparing and tenacious of his wealth and has thus become the richest oriental king for at least 200 years. He has sacks of copper money publicly piled up (into a heap 10 ft. wide and 30ft. high. Each sack holds about 4000 copper coins (Footnote : The Fathers of the third mission record that once they found the king busy counting a large sum of gold coins of many different values which he had ordered to mint. Behind him were some 150 plates-full of them, and a good number of bags. (Counting money) is his chief distraction everyday when he has retired. When the money has been counted and put in bags he has it put among his treasures which are very great."

According to Monserrate, the contemporary Jesuit, therefore, Akbar far outrivalled the fabulous king Midas, in the avaricious pleasure he used to derive from playing with and counting and recounting his treasure in the dark cellars where his hoards were stored.

Akbar accumulated that vast treasure by selling war prisoners as slaves in their thousands, by money-lending, by running gambling booths, by confiscation of the property of every deceased subject, through compulsory presents demanded from everybody coming to court, by having himself weighed against bullion, jewellery and gems at least twice a year, through various usurious levies extracted by flogging and torture, by robbing valuables from the dead and wounded on battlefields, through outright plunder of vast regions and crowded localities, through conquests of rich and prosperous kingdoms, through heavy ransoms and reparations and a number of other modes that human Ingenuity and cruelty could devise.

As a result of such extortions and a parsimonious nature Akbar had collected a large hoard.[10] "At Akbar's death in 1605 the cash in Agra fort exceeded 20,000,000 pounds sterling. It can hardly have been less than 15,000,000 in 1600 A. D."

10. P. 219, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Chapter XIV

PERSONALITY AND NATURE

In appearance Akbar was ugly and ungainly. By nature he was cruel, treacherous, and an illiterate sadist according to contemporary records.

The editor's introduction to Monserrate's Commentarius states "In the long line of Indian sovereigns the towering personalities of Ashoka and Akbar (because of his dread) stand high above the rest. They may be compared, and with profit. Akbar's greed for conquest and glory and his lack of sincerity form a marked contrast to Ashoka's paternal rule, genuine self-control and spiritual ambition. Akbar's wars were those of a true descendant of Timur, and had all the gruesome associations which this fact implies.

"The old notion that Akbar was a near approximation to Plato's philosopher king has been dissipated by modern researches. His character with its mixture of ambition and cunning has now been laid bare. He has been rightly compared to a pike in a pond preying upon his weaker neighbours. He was so close and self-contained with twists of words and deeds, so divergent one from the other, and at most times so contradictory, that even by much seeking one could not find a clue to his thoughts.

"Akbar was unable to give up his polygamous habits, for no importance need be attached to the

bazar gossip of the time that he once intended to distribute his wives among his grandees."

[1]"To prevent the great nobles from becoming insolent.. the king summons to court...and gives them many imperious commands, as though they were his slaves," notes Monserrate,

[2]"Zeladinus (Akbar) has broad shoulders, somewhat bandy legs well suited for horsemanship, and a light-brown complexion. He carries his head bent towards the right shoulder. His forehead is broad and open, his eyes so bright and flashing that they seem like a sea shimmering in the sunlight. His eyelashes are very long. His eyebrows are not strongly marked. His nose is straight and small, though not insignificant. His nostrils are widely open as if in derision. Between the left nostril and the upper lip there is a mole. He shaves his beard but wears a moustache like that of a Turkish youth who has not yet attained manhood. He does not cut his hair...(He wears) a turban into which he gathers up his hair. He limps in his left leg, though indeed he has never received any injury there. His body is neither too thin nor too stout. He is somewhat of a morose disposition. He is specially remarkable for his love of keeping great crowds of people around him and in his sight; and thus it comes about that his court is always thronged with multitudes of men of every type, though especially with the nobles whom he commands to come from their provinces and reside at court for a certain period each year.

1. Pp. 90-92, Commentarius, ibid.
2. Pp. 196-200, ibid.

When he goes outside his palace, he is surrounded and followed by these nobles and a strong body-guard. They have to go on foot until he gives them a nod to indicate that they may mount.

"He wears garments beautifully embroidered in gold. His military cloak comes down only as far as the knees and his boots cover his ankles completely. He wears gold ornaments, pearls and jewellery. He is fond of carrying a European sword and dagger. He is never without arms and is always surrounded even within his private apartments by a bodyguard of about 20 men variously armed.

"His table is very sumptuous generally consisting of more than 40 courses served in great dishes. These are brought into the royal dining hall covered and wrapped in linen clothes, which are tied up and sealed by the cook, for fear of poison. They are carried by youths to the door of the dining hall, other servants marching ahead and master of the household following. Here they are taken over by eunuchs, who hand them to the serving grls who wait on the royal table. He is accustomed to dine in private, except on the occasions of a public banquet. He rarely drinks wine but quenches his thrist by 'post' or water. When he has drunk immoderately of 'post' he sinks back stupefied and shaking. He dines alone reclining on an ordinary couch, which is covered with silken rugs and cushions stuffed with the fine down of some foreign plants."

[3]"Zeladinus receives foreigners and strangers

3. Pp. 204-5, ibid.

in a very different manner to that which he treats his own countrymen and subordinates. For he behaves with marked courtesy and kindness with foreigners. However he received the envoys of the Turkish viceroy of Arabia Felix, whose capital is Senaa, so ungraciously that the embassy vanished in a cloud of smoke. For, the chief ambassador was put in irons and banished for a long period to Lahore while his attendants made good their escape secretly...Zeladinus behaves so sternly towards the nobles who are under his proud sway that each one of them believes himself to be regarded not only as a contemptible creature but as the very lowest and meanest of mankind. For instance these nobles, if they commit offences, are punished more severely and relentlessly than the rest of the people, even those of the meanest degree."

[4]"He is entirely unable to read or write."

[5]"Zeladinus has about 20 Hindu chieftains as ministers and counsellors. They are devoted to him and are very wise and reliable. They are always with him and are admitted to the innermost parts of the palace, which is a privilege not allowed even to the Mongol nobles."

That Akbar allowed only Hindu nobles to the innermost apartments of the palace must not be misinterpreted and misunderstood to connote any nobility in Akbar's nature. He did so purely from requirements of his own safety and that of his treasure

4. P. 201, ibid.
5. P. 203, ibid.

and harem. His faith in Hindus is also a left-handed compliment to that community which even when compelled to submit to any tyrant through treachery and torture still remained faithful to its subjugator out of a sheer god-fearing gentle, courteous nature and an innate stupidity of loyally serving even a cruel and misbehaving despot. Akbar did not take Muslims into confidence except when Hindu localities were to be raided and looted, because he could not trust them with his harem, with his palace treasure and with his own person.

Dr. Shrivastav writes [6]"Akbar was a truant child, and did not sit down to read and write. So he remained illiterate all his life. Akbar himself admits that one need not be ashamed of being unlettered. He says 'the prophets were all illiterate. Believers should, therefore, retain one of their sons in that condition." This remark of Akbar is characteristic of his illiterate stupidity.

[7]"Akbar was a strange compound of reason and superstition . . . It is too much to affirm that Akbar was always above board in the matter of state-craft and in his dealings with his rivals and enemies. He was moreover sensitive to a point of honour in his relations with those Indian rulers, who declined to render him personal homage or made delay in doing so." Dr. Shrivastav's weakness of fancying goodness even in sheer evil makes him ignore all evidence and record only a mild rebuke about Akbar's character.

6. P. 497, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.
7. Pp. 509-11, ibid.

Even Badayuni, a fanatic Muslim and a subservient courtier despairs of Akbar's nature and remarks[8] "Lo! see all this in my day but ask no questions. But notwithstanding all this His Majesty's good luck overcame all enemies, so that large numbers of soldiers were not necessary."

[9]"Akin to his habitual control over a naturally violent temper was the artfulness with which he was wont to conceal his thoughts and real purposes. 'He never,' says Bartoli, 'gave anybody the chance to understand rightly his innermost sentiments or to know what faith or religions he held by, but in whatever way he could best serve his own interests, he used to feed one party or the other with the hope of gaining him to himself, humouring each side with fair words, and protesting that he had no other object with his doubts than to seek and find out by the guidance of their wise answers the simple truth then hidden from him. And in all business this was the characteristic of king Akbar a man apparently free from mystery and guile, as honest and candid as could be imagined—but in reality so closed and self-contained, with twists of words and deed so divergent one from the other, and most times so contradictory that even by much seeking one could not find the clue to his thoughts. Thus it often happened that a person comparing him today with what he was yesterday, could find no resemblance, and even an attentive observer, after long and familiar intercourse with whom, knew no more of him on the last day than he had

8. Pp. 194-200, Vol. II, Badayuni, ibid.
9. P. 248, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

known on the first.' That admirably worded description of Akbar's peculiar mind helps the historical student to understand to some extent the tortuous diplomacy and perfidious action, which on several occasions marked the emperor's political proceedings."

Chapter XV

TREACHERY

The frank appraisal of Akbar's character by some honest writers quoted in the last chapter is fully borne out by his dealings throughout his reign. His statecraft was crafty and treachery was a weapon Akbar used as frequently as any other in his armoury.

Smith notes that[1] "Akbar's policy with regard to the Portuguese was tortuous and perfidious. At the very moment when the missionaries were approaching his court in response to the friendly invitation addressed to the viceroy he had organized an army to capture the European ports because the Portuguese never allowed imperial ships to proceed to Mecca without a pass. Gulbadan Begum had to buy the pass ceding village Bulsar to the Portuguese in 1575. After her return she directed that it be retaken. "A party of young men was attacked and nine Portuguese were taken prisoner. They were brought to Surat and executed 'for refusing to apostatize. Their stout-hearted leader Duarte Perayra de Lacerda deserves to be commemorated by name. Their heads were sent to Fatehpur Sikri but Akbar pretended not to see them."

The above passage has many lessons for the student of history. Firstly it shows that even Mogul women had the same combination of bigotry, devilry and treachery as their male counterparts.

1. P. 145, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Their picturesque names should not prove a shroud to their vicious natures. Secondly it may be noted that Akbar was as fanatic a Muslim as any other and that during his reign too torturing and killing people who refused to be converted continued unabated. Thirdly it may be noted that Fatehpur Sikri, which is believed to have been completed around 1585 existed even in early 1580 when the first Jesuit Mission had arrived. They saw its towers and parapet from a distance. This should awaken the researcher to the realization that Fatehpur Sikri is an ancient Hindu township. What Akbar did was merely to transfer his seat of government to it instead of allowing those buildings to be wasted on Sheikh Salim Chisti and his band of fakirs.

Smith again notes[2] "The fathers were disgusted at the clear evidence of the duplicity of Akbar, who pretended a desire for the friendship of the King of Spain, to whom Portugal was then subject, while actually ordering hostilities against the Portuguese. Their Jesuit superiors had sent urgent letters requiring the missionaries to return...The missionaries themselves were eager to go, being wholly unable to accept Akbar's denial of the facts about war."

Smith observes[3] that "Prince (Murad), a drunken scamp, was filled with overweening pride and arrogance (when commanding a Mogul army along with Khan Khana Abdur Rahim). Badayuni in his accustomed ill-natured way observes that

2. P. 146. ibid.
3. Pp. 196-204, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

'His Highness (Murad) in these faults imitated his illustrious father (Akbar)'."

Asirgarh, a strong fortress was captured by Akbar through treachery. Smith observes that "In the 16th century Asirgarh was reckoned one of the wonders of the world. The summit of the hill, a space about 60 acres in extent, was amply provided with water. (It is about 12 miles nearly due north of Burhanpur).

"Two divergent and apparently irreconcilable accounts of the manner in which Akbar ultimately attained his purpose are on record. The official historians aver that the surrender of Asirgarh was due to an outbreak of deadly pestilence. The Jesuit version, based on unpublished letters of Jerome Xavier, who was in attendance on Akbar, states that possession of the fortress was gained by wholesale bribery of the officers of the garrison, and that earlier Miran Bahadur, the king, was lured into Akbar's camp and made prisoner by an act of shameful perfidy. The tale of alleged fatal pestilence...seems to be mostly invention. Akbar did not disdain to use the weapons of subterfuge and want of faith.

"Akbar occupied Burhanpur on March 31, 1600 without opposition and took up his abode in the palace of old rulers. (This should alert historians that far from building any structures at Fatehpur Sikri, Ajmer and other places Akbar occupied palaces of earlier Hindu rulers). On April 9 he arrived under the walls of Asirgarh. Akbar's huge host was estimated at 200,000 men. The emperor

resolved to rely on those arts of intrigue and guile in which he excelled. He, therefore, invited King Miran Bahadur to come out for an interview, swearing on his own royal head that the visitor would be allowed to return in peace...The King accordingly came out wearing a scarf in a way signifying submission, Akbar sitting motionless as a statue. As Miran Bahadur did reverence thrice and was advancing...a Mogul officer caught him by the head and threw him down forcing him to perform complete prostration (Sijda)—a ceremony on which Akbar laid much stress."

Akbar asked him to send orders in writing to the fort's garrison to surrender. When he refused he was detained by force. When the King's Abyssinian commandant heard the news he sent his son Mukarrab Khan to Akbar. When Akbar asked him whether his father (the commandant) was willing to surrender, he gave a spirited reply...Akbar instantly ordered the youth to be stabbed....The Abyssinian commander then saying that he might never behold the face of a king so faithless, taking a scarf in his hand and addressing the garrison asking them to defend the place strangled himself.

The siege continued. Akbar asked Xavier to arrange for getting some Portuguese engines of war. Xavier refused on the pretext of its being un-Christian. The real reason was that the Portuguese had only a short period before concluded a treaty with Miran Bahadur. There were also some Portuguese officers in the garrison who had advised Miran Bahadur against believing in Akbar's pledge.

"The free speech of Xavier irritated the barbarian to such a degree," says Smith "that he foamed with rage, and gave orders for the exclusion of the fathers from the imperial residence and their instant return to Goa. Xavier and his colleagues, therefore, withdrew. But on the advice of some friends they did not quit the locality (and later found Akbar to have cooled down)."

Akbar was now in a fix. In spite of his having broken his pledged word there was no sign of the fort surrendering. Time was precious because his elder son, Jehangir was then in active rebellion reigning at Allahabad as an independent king. "He was thus forced to use his only remaining weapon—bribery. The capitulation took effect on January 17, 1601 nearly 10½ months after the preparations for the siege had begun.

When the gates of Asirgarh were opened the population was found to be like that of a city, and the inhabitants were so numerous that there was a continuous throng of people coming out for a week. Some of them had suffered from weakness of sight and paralysis of the lower extremities. "The assertion of Abul Fazal that 25,000 persons perished in a pestilence is now seen to be an undoubted lie. The story of the deadly pestilence is an invention intended to conceal the discreditable means adopted by Akbar to gain possession of the greatest fort in India. The official authors' stories give a purposely muddled travesty of the facts. The murder of the commandant's son is represented as a suicide, and other clearly false statements are made which it would be tedious to specify here."

The captive king and his family were confined in the fort of Gwalior.

The student of Indian history would be erring on the safe side if he presumes all cases of alleged suicide as murders in Mogul history. Jehangir's wife was murdered in cold blood by Akbar and Jehangir in collusion. Daswandh the young Hindu painter also died a suspicious death. Rajput courtiers whose wives Akbar coveted were murdered. Behram Khan was murdered. Such instances could be multiplied.

Smith notes that "even in an Asiatic country in the year 1600 perfidy such as Akbar practised was felt to be discreditable. Abul Fazal and Faizi... Sirhandi agree in hiding their master's treachery. On many occasions Akbar showed himself to be crafty and insincere when dealing with affairs of state."

Even an ardent admirer of Akbar, Dr. Shrivastav is constrained to admit of Akbar's perfidy in subduing Kashmir. Akbar had sent an expedition against Kashmir under Bhagwandas.[4] Bhagwandas made peace with Yusuf Khan of Kashmir on February 22, 1586. The conditions were: 1. The ruler would deliver the land under the saffron crop, the duty on shawls and the mint to the imperial treasury and would acknowledge Akbar's suzerainty, and 2. That he would remain in charge of his principality......On the promise of safe conduct Bhagwandas took Yusuf Khan to court arriving there on March 28, 1586. But Akbar

4. Pp. 350-353, Vol. Akbar the Great, ibid.

did not approve of the treaty and took leaders of the expedition to task. Bhagwandas was temporarily forbidden the court and Yusuf Khan placed under surveillance. Akbar then sent another expedition. Bhagwandas feeling greatly embarrassed because of his pledged word for Yusuf Khan's safety stabbed himself. The expeditionary force left Lahore on June 28, 1586. Yaqub who had given up his father as lost assumed the title of Shah Ismail and prepared to defend his country." About October 6, Qasim Khan's forces entered the capital of Kashmir, Srinagar and read the proclamation in Akbar's name. "Qasim Khan's policy of repression and reprisals kept the Kashmir rebellion alive for a few years more, and Yaqub by his guerrilla tactics attempted to create diversion among the Mogul troops. Mirza Yusuf Khan succeeded Qasim Khan. Yaqub surrendered in July 1589. He was kept in custody. Later he was granted a jagir in Bihar. Yusuf Khan was released after Kashmir was annexed. Yusuf was made a mansabdar of 500 and was given a jagir in Bihar. He fought in Orissa (for Akbar) under Mansingh... The Kashmir episode leaves a bad taste, and is a blot on Akbar's character. He disregarded the plighted word of a favourite general. The petty jagir granted to him (Yusuf) was derogatory to one who had been a sovereign of a flourishing state."

Another instance of Akbar's treachery concerns the Hindu kingdom of Bhatha (modern Rewa). [5]"Vikramajit, a boy of tender age who was the

5. Pp, 382-3, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.

grandson of the late Raja Ramchandra repudiated allegiance to Akbar. Consequently early in 1594 an army under Rai Tipurdas was deputed against him. The campaign lasted for more than two years. (When the garrison could not be made to surrender by force of arms, it was) agreed to allow their young ruler Vikramajit to go to Akbar's court only if a great noble came to Bandhu and guaranteed safety of life and restoration of the state to him, besides a safe conduct back to Bandhu. The garrison naturally expected that they would (then) be permitted to retain possession of the fort. But Akbar insisted that the fort must be first evacuated and then only it would be restored to the young ruler The garrison rejected the offer and the siege continued. The Mugals who had occupied the country cut off supplies which caused some distress to the besieged. Moreover, Tipurdas seemed to have been able to corrupt some members of the garrison, for Abul Fazal writes that 'liberality was made the key for delivering up the fort.' The siege lasted for eight months and 20 days. For want of supplies the fort capitulated on July 8, 1597. The fort was evacuated and a great deal of plunder was obtained. It was not restored to Raja Vikramajit. In April 1601 Duryodhan, another grandson of the late Ramchandra, was recognized as Raja, and the fort of Bandhu was made over to him. Bhartichand was appointed the Raja's guardian."

[6]"It is too much to affirm that Akbar was always above board in the matter of statecraft and in his dealings with his rivals and enemies.

6. Pp. 511-14, ibid.

He was moreover sensitive to a point of honour in his relations with those Indian rulers, who declined to render him personal homage or made delay in doing so. This exaggerated sensitiveness accounts for his failure to win over Rana Pratap and for his harsh treatment towards Raja Ramchandra of Bhatha and Yusuf Khan of Kashmir. His long reign constituted a period of incessant activity, of wars, campaigns with only small intervals of peace. . . . How dexteriously he won the cooperation and support (sic) of the Rajput rulers in Rajasthan by playing them off against one another is a story that deserves to be told in one separate volume."

HYPOCRISY

Despite some, imaginary sanctimonious sayings of Akbar recorded by flatterers like Abul Fazal Akbar's seemingly innocuous actions were invariably characterised by hypocrisy.

Vincent Smith observes that Akbar "stopped without ever reaching the point of definitely becoming a Zoroastrian. He acted in the same way with regard to Hinduism, Jainism and Christianity. He went so far in each religion that different people had reasonable ground for affirming him to be a Zoroastrian, Hindu, Jain or Christian"[1]...

[2]"About this time (1580 A. D.), becoming alarmed at the widespread resentment aroused by his innovations, Akbar adopted a policy of calculated hypocrisy. When on his way back from Ajmer he caused a lofty tent to be furnished as a travelling mosque, in which he ostensibly prayed five limes a day as a pious Muslim should do. A little later he carried his hypocrisy still further. A certain Mir Abu Turab had returned from Mecca bringing with him a stone supposed to bear an impression of the prophet's foot. Akbar knowing well that the thing was not genuine went out in person to meet it."

1. P. 118, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.
2. P. 130, ibid.

[3]"The reader will not fail to observe" says Smith, "the inconsistency between the second and third regulations issued by Akbar (2) No man should be interfered with on account of his religion, and anyone was to be allowed to go over to any religion he pleased. (3) If a Hindu woman fall in love with a Musalman, and entered the Muslim religion, she should be taken by force from her husband and restored to her family."

While Smith rightly points out the mutual inconsistency of the several regulations said to have been issued by Akbar we wish to emphasize that no such regulations were ever proclaimed. They were all a hypocritic make-believe concocted and recorded by inventive flatterers like Abul Fazal to beguile the tedium of a weary hour, mislead the public, humour the sovereign with unctuous flattery and obtain immoral gratifications for inventing pious prevarications. Had they been really promulgated Akbar himself, his sons, and courtiers should have been the first to be deprived of the hundreds of Hindu women that were being daily rounded up to be dumped in the Mogul harems. Though Akbar possessed innumerable Hindu girls in his harem he had a lecherous eye on Rani Durgawati. Since she died fighting, Akbar had reluctantly to make-do only with her sister and daughter-in-law. They were promptly dragged to his harem. Far from restoring any woman to her husband Akbar used to tear away women from their homes and husbands. His generals like Sharfuddin, Asaf Khan, Adham Khan and the

3. P 186, ibid.

common Muslim soldiery used to lift Hindu women by the thousands. So none should believe in the sanctimonious humbug of ever so many pious regulations said to have been issued by Akbar.

To intersperse the sickening, sadist accounts of their patrons' cruel regimes, with imaginary sanctimonius utterances and fancied charities is an old game of Muslim chroniclers. Thus Tamerlain Ferozshah Tughlak, Sikandar Lodi, Sher Shah, Jehangir and a host of others who perpetrated the most horrid and heinous deeds of mass massacre, torture and rape are all fictitiously credited with having mercifully constructed tanks, serais, rest houses, alms houses, shady high ways water booths and the like for the ordinary way-farer. It is time every reader and scholar of history awakes to this realization. To put faith in such sanctimonious hypocrisy in the face of overwhelming incriminating evidence would be puerile and pathetic.

Smith quotes Xavier, a Jesuit priest at Akbar's court, that Akbar used to pose as a prophet "[4]wishing it to be understood that he works miracles through healing the sick by means of the water in which he washes his feet. (Footnote : Badayuni records that 'if other than Hindus came and wished to become disciples at any sacrifice His Majesty reproved or punished them.')" This testimony by a Jesuit visitor and a Muslim courtier clearly proves that Akbar's tyrrany over the Hindus included pouring down their throats

4. P. 180, ibid.

water in which he had washed his feet. According to Badayuni this dirty and humiliatng privilege (sic) was specially reserved by Akbar for Hindus. If he could stoop so low an illiterate Akbar may even have forced worse indignities on his helpless subjects.

"[5]Akbar was not influenced merely by intellectual curiosity and religious sentiment when he bestowed unprecedented personal favours on the revered (Jesuit) fathers accredited to his court. He was a crafty and tortuous politician. He always cherished the hope of destroying the Portuguese dominion (but) the rebellion of his eldest son and the death of the younger princes put a stop to all his ambitions... He openly avowed his designs with his intimates."

One of the sayings of Akbar fabricated by his chroniclers is "[6]were it not for the thought of the difficulty of sustenance, I would prohibit men from eating meat. The reason why I do not altogether abandon it myself is that many others might willingly forego it likewise and be thus cast into despondency."

The hypocrisy of the above meaningless concoction is apparent.

"[7]Akbar's actions at times gave substantial grounds for the reproach that he was not unwilling to be regarded as a God on earth (Footnote:

5. P. 190, ibid.
6. P. 243, ibid.
7. P. 255, ibid.

His flatterer, Faizi, as translated by Blochmann, ventured to write: 'the old-fashioned prostration is of no advantage to thee; see Akbar and you see God (Ain. Vol I, page 561)."

Badayuni says "[8]After a time the titles 'the only one, the Absolute, the Perfect Man became commonly applied to the emperor."

Badayuni, a fanatic Muslim notes[9] with repentance that (tempted like others to curry favour with Akbar by idolizing him) he had his new-born son blessed by Akbar instead of by Qazis and Mullas, only to find that his son died within six months.

Akbar tried all along to project himself as a prophet, a perfect man and God himself "On [10]Friday, June 26, 1579 he mounted the pulpit in the grand Jami Mosque of Fatehpur Sikri and recited Khutba...According to Badayuni Akbar stammered and trembled while reading it and had to be helped descend the pulpit...It was believed by some that the emperor was inspired by an ulterior motive" which was to impose himself on his helpless subjects as emperor, prophet and God all rolled into one.

"[11]On September 8, 1579 Akbar set on, what proved to be his last pilgrimage to the Khwaja's shrine at Ajmer. This was within a week of the promulgation of the so-called infallibility decree...

8. P. 266, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.
9. P. 259, ibid.
10. P. 240, Akbar the Great, ibid.
11. P. 245, ibid.

He had lost faith... Yet he undertook it as a means of calming the public... While at Ajmer he exiled Abdun Nabi and Makhdum-ul-Mulk to Mecca. At Sambhar, on his return journey, he directed Shahbaz Khan to proceed against Rana Pratap."

Here Dr. Shrivastava admits that Akbar's last trip to Ajmer was just to hoodwink his Muslim subjects. This is only partly true. Had Akbar wanted to lull fanatic Muslims into the belief that he himself was a devout Muslim he need not have gone to faraway Ajmer. In his capital itself he could have visited some other shrine or recited the Koran five times a day. His real motive was never to perform any pilgrimage to the Chisti tomb in Ajmer. He had never any faith in or respect for anybody. Akbar's trips to Ajmer were to organize ruthless campaigns against the gallant Hindu kings of Rajasthan mustered under the inspiring leadership of Rana Pratap. Ever since Akbar decided to discontinue his atrocious, all destroying inroads into Rajasthan he ceased going to Ajmer. What is usually described as a hunting expedition or a pilgrimage was nothing but a ruse to enable the Muslims swoop on Hindu areas unannounced. Such ruses are always spread in aggressive wars. The reader should, therefore, stop believing any more in Akbar's or other Muslim rulers' religious pretentions.

Dr. Shrivastava who had earlier stated that in 1579 itself Akbar had lost faith in Islamic practices, says that "[12]On October 8, 1583 Akbar celebrated

12. P. 323, Akbar the Great, ibid.

Idul Fitr by holding a banquet. At a polo match Birbal fell from his horse. Akbar went to the Raja and graciously relieved him by his breathing."

From the above passage it is quite clear that Akbar had never ceased to be a fanatic Muslim. Secondly his pretensions to prophet-hood and spiritual powers were another irksome source of his filthy tyrannies on his subjects. We have already seen how he compelled Hindus to gulp his wash-water. Similarly he used to blow his liquor-smelling and dope-laden foul breath on other peoples' drinking water or face. The poor-victim dared not remonstrate lest he be sent to the gallows and his women be molested. He, therefore meekly put up with Akbar's filthy antics and feigned to derive great benefit from it. That satisfied Akbar's vanity. In this hoax that he practised on his hapless victims Akbar takes the cake among all Muslim rulers' malpractices. Poor Birbal had to suffer the added humiliation of having Akbar's foul breath blown on his injured face. This literally amounted to adding insult to injury.

[13]"Akbar was stern to his nobles and vassals so that none dared lift his head too high. He was pleased to accept their presents though often with prudent dissimulation he pretended not to see them."

[14]"Until 1579 Akbar used to pay regular visits, at least once every year, and sometimes even twice

13. P. 503 "Akbar the Great", ibid.
14. P. 504, ibid.

to the shrine of Sheikh Moinuddin Chisti of Ajmer. His battle cry then was "Ya Muin" after the name of the Khwaja." When a battle-cry is associated with a pilgrimage, undertaken seemingly erratically once or twice a year, the implication is obvious. It clearly means that Akbar used to go to Ajmer merely to wage battle against the Rajputs. His object was not spiritual solace through pilgrimage but dealing death and destruction on the Hindus. In this deadly game the name of Moinuddin Chisti is used as a convenient decoy to hide the chief motive of his move out of the capital to distant Ajmer in Rajasthan.

[15]"It is sometimes said that Akbar's conduct in matters of religious belief and worship was guided by political expediency." This is a clear admission of Akbar's rank hypocrisy. We only wish that it be brought to the fore not "sometimes" but always in talking or writing about Akbar.

[16]"He would cure the ailing children by looking at them or giving them water over which he had breathed. He would have people believe that he performs miracles, healing the sick with the water with which he washes his feet. Many young women pay vows to him te get their children cured or that they may have children. And if these things come to pass they bring him offerings, as to a saint, whioh though they may be of little worth, are willingly received and highly valued by him."

15. P. 506, Akbar the Great, ibid.
16. P. 61, 'Payne, Akbar and the Jesuits', quoted on page 511, Akbar the Great, Vol. I, ibid.

European visitors to Akbar's court have often misunderstood and therefore credulously misrepresented dealings at Akbar's court. To get at the real import of their notings one has to understand the contemporary atmosphere. All these Western visitors had practically no knowledge of the court language and, therefore, had to depend on superficial observations or motivated bluffs and brainwashing by sycophant Muslim courtiers. We know from experience that a foreign visitor whose contacts are restricted to cabinet circles goes back and sings the praises of his royal hosts. Those who get the opportunity to know the people and listen to their tales of misery would paint a different picture. Thus, European visitors to Akbar's court laboured under a double disadvantage namely of language and contacts. Hence readers of their memoirs must be extra cautious in properly interpreting their notings.

We, fully accept that Akbar used to be surrounded by throngs of men, women and children. But the observation that they came to seek spiritual bliss for themselves or their children or to be blessed with children is incorrect.

The crowd around Akbar was always of a mixed sort. The throng included courtiers body guards, menial servants, cringing scribes, prisoners, European or Indian visitors, some mere idle gazers and the common men, women and children.

These last-mentioned common people didn't come to Akbar for fun or spiritual solace but for temporal relief from Akbar's tyrannical and whimsical orders and the rapacity of his officials. In India ruled for 1000 years by alien barbarians it had been a common practice for married women to rush to the tyrant overlord's doorstep and lay their children at his feet in a bid to soften his heart so that he may call a halt to the atrocities committed by his barbaric, greedy and lewd hordes. Those who could escape rape, plunder and massacre fled in terror to seek some relief from Akbar.

That scene of multitudes thronging his court day and night in abject subjection sobbing, wailing and pathetically imploring the soverign to have mercy on them and their darling children laid at his feet in complete surrender and humiliating submission was misunderstood by the Jesuits ignorant of Persian and Hindi as signifying people's yearning to obtain spiritual bliss from Akbar.

Such a scene immensely gratified Akbar. It satisfied his vanity. The 'feel' of absolute power over such masses of mortals to make or mar their fortunes exhilarated him. He felt greatly elated when thronging crowds looked up to him in pathetic submission as the one and only saviour and arbiter of their destiny. His cruel Majesty Akbar would then 'graciouly' break into his antics of 'comforting' them by asking them to drink his filthy wash-water or foul-breath-blown water.

The descriptions of an Akbar or a Jehangir sitting in the palace—window at sunset to be seen and supplicated by crowds of hapless subjects has to be understood in this light. When European visitors refer to such scenes their descriptions must

be properly understood and interpreted in the light of what we know of Akbar's character and doings. Earlier historians have all failed to grasp this aspect of the throngs that kept hanging around at Akbar's door.

FAMINES

Interminable revolts, reprisals and counter reprisals, burning and counter-burning plunder and massacre characterised the 1,000-year-long Muslim rule in India. With their civic life shattered, their homes battered and their family life reduced to a shambles the citizenry had to run for its life. Those who escaped massacre had to remain in hiding in forests and mountainous country. Such turmoil led to frequent famines. Akbar's reign was no exception. His tenure too was marked by some of the most horrid famines in human history giving a lie to claims that Akbar's was a benevolent rule. His regime being as atrocious as that of any other sultan or Badshah, if not more, it was bound to result in severe famines.

Vincent Smith writes[1] that in "the famines of 1555-56 the capital (Delhi) was devastated and the mortality was enormous. The historian Badayuni with his own eyes witnessed the fact that men ate their own kind, and the appearance of famished sufferers was so hideous that one could scarcely look upon them ... The whole country was a desert, and no husbandsman remained to till the ground.

"Gujarat, one of the richest provinces in India, and generally reputed to be almost exempt from the risk of famine, suffered severely for six months

1. Pp. 288-89, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

in 1573-74. Pestilence as usual followed on starvation, so that the inhabitants, rich and poor, fled the country and were scattered abroad.

"Abul Fazal with characteristic vagueness records that in 1583-84, as prices were high on account of the dryness of the year, the means of subsistence of many people came to an end (Akbarnama Vol. iii, Chapter IXXIV, p. 625). He does not trouble to give any details or even to mention which provinces were affected. If we may judge from the slovenly way in which he treats the tremendous calamity of 1595-98 we may infer that the famine of 1583-84 was serious. It does not seem to be mentioned or even alluded to by other chroniclers.

"The famine which began in 1595 and lasted three or four years until 1598 equalled in its horrors the one which had occurred in the accession year, and excelled the visitation by reason of its longer duration. Abul Fazal, as already observed, slurs over the calamity by using vague words designed to conceal the severity of the distress and to save the credit of the imperial government. (Footnote: He gives details of the famine in the accession year in order to show that things improved when Akbar ascended the throne).

"Epidemics and inundation... occasionally marred Akbar's reign. . .

"[2]The emperor Babur, in his autobiography mentions that the parganas were surrounded by jungles, and that the people of the parganas often

2. P. 290, ibid.

fled to these jungles to avoid paying their revenue."

One may well imagine the terror which the exaction of revenue by the Muslim administration struck in the hearts of the citizens. They preferred to brave the genuine forest beasts than get torn or tortured to pieces by human brutes.

[3]"At the time of famine and distress parents were allowed to sell their children."

There is a touch of irony in Badayuni's observation above. While Akbar, it seems, graciously allowed his subjects to sell their children for food in times of famines, children used to be kidnapped almost everyday in the chaos that reigned in those days. Citizens were also compelled to surrender or sell their children for paying Akbar's revenue. Such children passing through the mill of abject slavery and menial duties including sodomy ultimately ended up by being converted to Islam. That automatically estranged them from Hinduism and Hindusthan and made them feel like para-Arabs or para-Turks.

So, famine or no famine, under Muslim rule in India children were a commodity for sale as any chattel either to obtain food or respite from governmental revenue.

"[4]In this year (981 A.H)" says Badayuni "there was in Gujerat a general pestilence and also a dearness of grain to such an extent that one

3. P. 391 of Badayuni's chronicle quoted by Blochmann in his translation of Ain-i-Akbari, Bibliotheca Indica series.
4. P. 189, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

maund of jawari sold for 120 Tankas, and numberless people died."

A student of Muslim chronicles must remember that they generally mention famines, pestilences or tyranny and torture only when such calamities affect and afflict a substantial section of Muslims themselves. As for instance Badayuni condemns Akbar's general Peer Mohammed for the atrocities be committed, not on Hindus but on Sayyads and ulamas holding korans on their heads as talismans - cum - helmets. To Muslim chroniclers Hindu men, women and children were a natural fodder for fanaticsm to feed on, that is why almost invariably they use the words 'dancing girls' and 'prostitutes' for Hindu women and 'slaves kafirs, thieves, robbers, dacoits and infidels as synonymous with Hindu males. Even though Muslim chronicles had a 1000-year-chain succession in Hindusthan, a Hindu majority country, as a rule they seem to be unaware of the Hindu. They show a marked preference for the bitterst invectives uttered with fanatic emphasis when referring to Hindus.

Describing another horrid pestilence, in Gaud (the capital of Bengal), Badayuni notes "various diseases attacked the constitutions of the Amirs, and everyday hosts upon hosts of peopie having played out their existence bade farewell to one another and how many thousands so ever were told off for that country it cannot be stated that a hundred even returned home. Things came to such a pass that the living were unable to bury the dead, and threw them into the river. Every

hour and every minute news came to the ear of the Khan Khana of the death of Amirs" but he wouldn't listen.

From the reference to (Muslim) burials above, and none to Hindu cremations the reader may judge the justice of our remark made earlier that Muslim chroniclers record calamities and atrocities only when a substantial section of the Muslim population was afflicted. To them the vast majority of Hindus were of no consequence at all because under Muslim rule Hindus were expendable property. The implication of the Jisziya tax was precisely that Hindus were suftered to live, if at all, and even as they lived they were to be ruled by Muslims and were to sweat and toil and slave for Muslims.

As seen above, during Akbar's reign his entire domain from Bengal in the east to Gujerat in the west fell prey to deadly pestilence and frightful famine.

Dr. Shrivastava describing the Gujerat famine observes[5] that "when the (Bihar) military campaign was making successful progress, Gujerat in the west was, in 1574-75, in the throes of a dreadful famine and epidemic the like of which had not been seen or heard in living memory. Both lasted for five to six months. The famine was not caused by drought or the failure of seasonal rains, but was due to destruction wrought by prolonged wars and rebellions, constant marching and counter-marching of troops, the killing of men on a large scale, and the breakdown of administrative machinery

5. Pp. 169-171, Akbar the Great, ibid.

and the economic system. The historian Mohammed Hanif Qandahari rightly observes that the plague and famine occurred not only on account of the contamination of water and air but also because of the misrule and oppression by the Afghans, Abyssinians and Mirzas. The epidemic which was most probably the plague, preceded the famine. The calamity was widespread and covered the whole of Gujerat, and a large number of inhabitants left the province. The mortality was so high that on an average 100 cart-loads of dead bodies were taken out for burial in the city of Ahmedabad alone, and it was impossible to find them graves or grave clothes. The severity was equally felt in the towns and districts of Broach, Patan and Baroda, and in fact in the whole of Gujerat. The price of jowar rose to six rupees a maund. Horses and other animals had to be fed on tree barks. There is nothing on record to show that government undertook any relief measures. Abul Fazal the court historian, is silent on the calamity. Had Akbar ordered any kind of relief he must not have missed the opportunity of praising his royal patron."

Dr. Shrivastava has hit the nail quite on the head when he observes that the famine was not brought about by natural causes but by Muslim chaos and misrule. But we would like to add that the cause assigned to this particular famine during Akbar's reign applies equally to all famines during a millenium of Muslim regimes in India.

The historian Mohammad Hanif Qandahari is mistaken in blaming the famine on the misdeeds of Afghans, Abyssinians and Mirzas alone. In this he

is being partisan and partial. All Muslims from Mohammad bin Kasim downwards whether they were Turks, Arabs, Iranians, Afghans, Abyssinians or Mongols, to whichever dynasty or sect they belonged, proved equally cruel and destructive. There is no basis to choose a few as better or worse than the rest. They were animated by a common hatred for Hindus and Hindu culture and they all shared the firm belief that the surest way of attaining Islamic heaven was by destroying Hindudom, and compelling everybody to profess Islam.

Another point to be emphasized in the description of the Gujerat famine cited above, is that if 100 cartloads of Muslim corpses alone had to be taken out of Ahmedabad everyday the number of Hindus dying must have, been a hundredfold more since Muslims may have formed only one percent of the population. Moreover the Muslims were the rulers. If they themselves suffered 100 cartloads of casualties a day the loss to the downtrodden and deeply hated Hindu community may well be imagined. The 100 cartloads of corpses a day were obviously exclusively of the Muslims as is apparent from the fact that they were taken for burial and not cremation.

That during Akbar's reign almost every part of India suffered from a terrible famine not only from east to west but also from north to south is apparent from the report that "[6]during the emperor's stay in Kashmir there was a severe famine in the valley (May to November 1597).

6. P. 408, Akbar the Great, ibid.

Things became very dear and husbandsmen had to abandon their hearths and homes. Jerome Xavier writes that mothers left their children in the streets to die. The Jesuit missionaries picked them up and baptized them (Maclagan, p. 56; Du Jarric, pp. 77-78)."

About the Gujerat famine Vincent Smith observes that "Gujerat (less liable to famine than most parts of India) suffered severely from both famine and pestilence (1574-75) lasting for nearly six months . . . Prices rose to an extreme height . . . Horses and cows were reduced to feeding on tree barks (Tabakat-i-Akbari, Elliot & Dowson, Vol V, p. 384)."

Around 1596 "[8]the whole of Northern India suffered from a terrible famine," says Smith, "which lasted continuously for three or four years beginning in 1595-96. A contemporary historian records 'a kind of plague also added to the horrors of this period, and depopulated whole houses and cities, to say nothing of hamlets and villages. In consequence of the dearth of grain and the necessities of ravenous hunger, men ate their own kind. The streets and roads were blocked up with dead bodies, and no assistance would be rendered for their removal (footnote: Nurul Hakk, p. 193). Abul Fazal characteristically glosses over the calamity in language which gives no notion whatever of the severity of the situation. Abul Fazal says 'Under the imperial orders, the necessitous received daily assistance to their satisfaction, and every

7. P. 93, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.
8. Pp. 192-4, ibid.

class of the indigent was entrusted to the care of those who were able to care for them (Elliot & Dowson, VI, p. 94)'. That statement is substantially false. The opportunity for offering one more morsel of flattery to his master appealed to Abul Fazal far more strongly than the suffering of nameless millions . . . The mortality must have been appalling. Ferishta, whose well known work is considered the best Persian summary of Indian history, does not even mention this famine, which accordingly is ignored by Elphinstone. If a minor historian had not happened to write the few lines quoted above, even the bare fact that such a calamity occurred would not be on record...The Jesuit reports of 1597 note that in that year Lahore suffered from a great pestilence which gave the fathers the opportunity and intense satisfaction of baptizing many infants who had been abandoned (Footnote, Maclagan, p. 71)."

Fully endorsing Smith's observation above about the utter unreliability of Muslim chroniclers we would like to add that when Abul Fazal mentions the poor having been entrusted to the care of the well-to-do, that has a deeper meaning. It is possible that some poor Muslims, if at all, may have been billeted with or made a feeding liability on some well-to-do courtiers whom Akbar intended to punish or impoverish. About Hindus dying in their millions Akbar would never care. A very cautious and alert mind is called for understanding and interpreting the overt and covert meaning of accounts written by Machiavellian Muslim chroniclers.

FANATICISM

Akbar was born a Muslim, he lived as a Muslim and died a Muslim—and a fanatic one at that. And yet in the common run of histories he is painted as having been anything from a devout Hindu, to an agnostic liberal or a generous synthesizer of the best principles of all religions. Like every other aspect Akbar's Islamic fanaticism too has been whitewashed. Such an image of Akbar was deliberately fostered under Muslim rule so that in an unbroken 1,000-year-long history of unrelieved and sickening atrocities at least one Muslim monarch should be presentable to posterity. Since Muslim rule lasted for 253 long years after Akbar that assiduously fostered image took such root in the public mind that Akbar came to be unquestioningly accepted as a broadminded ruler who was very liberal and tolerant in matters of religion as also in every other aspect of his rule. A few who may have suspected this image to be counterfeit dared not air their views under the delusion that such falsehoods if left undisturbed lead to communal harmony, or that their slender voice may not be heard or would be denounced in the public hullabaloo of Akbar's greatness. We have overwhelming evidence to prove that Akbar was no less fanatic an Islamite than any other Muslim ruler in India. There is nothing to choose amongst them. They were all fiercely fanatic.

We have already proved earlier that the pious assertions of flatterers like Abul Fazal or Badayuni about Akbar having abolished the Jiziya (which was a discriminatory exaction taken from Hindus so that a Muslim monarch may suffer them to live) is contradicted by facts. Individual after individual like the Jain monk Hirvijaya Suri and Surjan Singh had to ask for special exemption. And even when that exemption was ostensibly granted it was never taken or meant to be taken seriously.

Similar is the case with the fancied ban on cow-slaughter. In Akbar's reign cow-slaughter continued unabated as it did throughout Muslim rule. A number of historians like Sir H.M. Elliot and Vincent Smith have repeatedly pointed out that sanctimonious and self-righteous assertions in chronicles like Akbarnama and Jehangirnama are not to be taken seriously. Those who claim that they have a written firman indicating that Akbar did ban cow slaughter should first examine whether the document they possess is genuine or a forgery. Secondly they would also find that Akbar's make-believe orders were a form of deception. Like the exemptions from Jiziya agreed to on Hiravijaya Suri's or Surjan Singh's entreaties these orders were a dead letter.

Vincent Smith notes how the Bible which the Jesuits at his court presented to Akbar, was [1]"returned to them at a much later date", when he felt that it was no use or no longer necessary to dangle the carrot of his liberalism or of his being in precipitate love with Christianity.

1. P. 125, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Smith quotes Sir Thomas Roe, a contemporary Englishman who had visited India, as saying [2]"Akbar died in the formal profession of his sect. (Foster, P. 132)". Father Boelho asserts that Akbar "at last died as he was born, a Mohammaden."

[3]"Notwithstanding the fine phrases about general tolerance which occupy so large a space in the writings of Abul Fazal and the sayings of Akbar many acts of fierce intolerance were committed."

[4]"A letter despatched on December 10, 1580 by Aquaviva to the rector of Goa says 'our ears hear nothing but that hideous and heinous name of Mahomet. . . . In a word, Mahomet is everything here. . . .Anti Christ reigns.'

[5]"Akbar stopped without ever reaching the point of definitely becoming a Zoroastrian. He acted in the same way with regard to Hinduism, Jainism and Christianity. He went so far in each religion that different people had reasonable ground for affirming him to be a Zoroastrian, Hindu, Jain or Christian."

We have already quoted, in an earlier chapter, the court chronicler Badayuni that in the battle of Haldighat against Rana Pratap Badayuni and Akbar's general were unanimous in shooting into the ranks of the Hindus of Akbar's own army on the ground that a Hindu killed on any side was a gain to Islam. This spirit of murdering and massacring the very Hindus who were jeopardizing their

2. P. 234, ibid.
3. P. 159, ibid.
4. P. 125, ibid.
5. P. 118, ibid.

lives to extend Akbar's empire, is a clear indication that Akbar was a fiercely fanatic Muslim. Had he been the liberal he is painted to be his generals and soldiers would not have dared to kill at least Hindu allies and helpers.

[6]"The persons invited to share in and listen to the debates were confined at first to Muslims of four classes, namely Shaikhs, Sayyids, Ulama and Amirs. . . . The House of Worship was designed for the use of Muslims only."

[7]"His mother Hamida Bano Begum and father's sister Gulbadan Begam were extremely devout Muslims and hostile to all innovation. Accompanied by Salima Sultan Begum (widow of Behram Khan and wife to Akbar) they started on a pilgrimage of Mecca in October 1575. They were detained in Surat by the Portuguese for about a year. Ultimately they got away safely, performed the pilgrimage and landed safely in India early in 1582. Gulbadan Begum who wrote memoirs of considerable interest, preserved in one incomplete manuscript, has left no record of her experience as a pilgrim."

[8]"A large party of male pilgrims under the charge of a leader (Mir Haji) was also sent. The novel and costly arrangement was continued for five or six years, and Akbar wanted to go on pilgrimage himself (but he yielded to the dissuasion of his ministers because of the great dangers involved). The emperor issued a general order...that

6. Pp. 94-95, ibid.
7. P. 96, ibid.
8. P. 96, ibid.

anyone could go on pilgrimage at state expenes o the treasury."

When a Muslim monarch of Hindusthan himself yearns to go on pilgrimage to Mecca and gives a blanket order that anybody may go on the Islamic pilgrimage to Mecca at state expense from money extracted by way of usurious and discriminatory taxes from Hindus to send Muslim citizens to Islamic territories what else is he if not a fanatic Muslim!

We have also quoted earlier that Akbar had provided Abdun Nabi with Rs. 7,000 for his pilgrimage to Mecca.

Akbar's goading two sects of Hindu priests, the Kurs and the Puris at Thaneshwar, to annihilate each other, and aiding the weaker side in that deadly combat with his own fierce Muslim troopers so that they may see to it that none of them remained alive, shows how fiercely fanatic a Muslim Akbar was.

We have already quoted references to Akbar's pilgrimages once or even twice a year to the tomb of the Muslim fakir Sheikh Moinuddin Chisti in Ajmer, and his patronizing Sheikh Salim Chistii also a Muslim. Had Akbar been inclined towards any other religion he would not have confined his devotions only to Muslim fakirs.

Throughout Akbar's reign temples used to be razed to the ground or misappropriated as mosques and cows used to be slaughtered in them as happened in the battle for Nagarkot exactly as under any other Muslim ruler.

[9]"The Christian fathers got little opportunity of holding religious discussion with Akbar or influencing him in favour of Christianity. The fathers were gradually losing patience...Akbar silenced Xavier by telling him that the freedom accorded him in preaching his religion was in itself a great service". (Xavier's letter of Aug. 1, 1599, Maclagan, P. 57, also Du Jarric, Pp 90-1).

Akbar was such a sworn enemy of Hinduism that he used to oblige Jesuit priests by atrociously making over to them forcibly seized Hindu temples and mansions for conversion into churches or similar Christian use. Thus mediaeval churches in Agra are Hindu buildings. Dr. Shrivastava records [10]"A notable Hindu family claimed a few houses that had been given to the fathers to provide accommodation to married Christian converts. Xavier succeeded in getting Akbar's orders from Agra and the houses remained in the possession of the Lahore mission. The hostile Hindu family suffered from vicissitudes to the great satisfaction of Pinheiro (Maclagan, Pp.61-64). Xavier in his letter dated Sept. 6, 1604 wrote "The church being so large and beautiful, everything can be well carried out."

The reader may note how high-handed and atrocious it was for a Muslim sovereign of Hindusthan to turn out a wealthy Hindu family, usurp its property and make it over to the Portuguese

9. Pp. 409-410, Akbar the Great, A.L. Shrivastava, ibid.
10. P. 407, ibid.

so that he may continue to get armaments from them with which he could mow down the Hindus.

Regarding the Nagarkot campaign Mr. Shelat notes that [11]"A treaty was arrived at. The Mogul general caused a mosque to be built over the gateway of the Raja's palace."

Here as elsewhere throughout Muslim chronicles the word "built" has been used to mean misappropriating a Hindu building for Muslim use. It is well known that Hindu gateways used to have a music house on top. So the mosque over the Nagarkot palace gateway was nothing but the atrocious occupation of at least a part of the Hindu Raja's palace. This was a common practice. That is how during 1,000—years of Muslim rule there is practically no Hindu shrine left without conversion into a tomb or mosque wholly or in part. This is proved by the existence of a Muslim tomb at almost all important Hindu shrines like Kashi Vishwanath, birthplace of Lord Krishna, the place where Lord Krishna died, the palace of Lord Rama, Palitana and Girnar hills, Somnath, and Ahmedabad's many mosques and tombs.

And from the instance of the Agra church it is clear that all mediaeval Christian churches too are Hindu buildings or Hindu land usurped and alienated by India's Muslim rulers to favour the Christians ot the cost of the Hindus.

About Gujerat ruled over by other Muslims during Akbar's time Mr. Shelat notes that[12]

11. P. 118, Akbar, J.M. Shelat, ibid.
12. Pp. 122-129, ibid.

"Mahmud marched against Champaner and took it from Fattu together with the treasures and nearly 500 women of Darya Khan. In spite of his personal bravery, Mahmud was a man of low tastes and indulged the pleasures of vulgar company. On his return to Ahmedabad he was once again a prisoner in Bhadra fort....At last relieved from the tyranny of the usurping nobles Mahmud wielded the sceptre personally for the next nine years. He began to parade his religious zeal by persecuting his Hindu subjects. No Hindu was allowed to ride on horseback in any city nor was he allowed to enter a bazar without a patch of red on the back of a white garment or a patch of white on a red one or to wear a dress of one colour. The Hindu festivals of Holi or Diwali were banned and so also public worship and the ringing of bells in temples. Even those who worshipped in the privacy of their homes did so with fear. No Rajput or Koli was allowed to move about unless, like a criminal he was branded on his arm. Anybody found without this humiliating mark was at once put to death. (Bayley, Gujerat, 427)."

Had Akbar abolished these humiliating impositions on Hindus, that prevailed in Gujerat histories would have hailed it as proof of Akbar's impartiality, generosity and sense of justice. But since there is no mention of any change in the condition of the Hindus even after Akbar conquered Gujerat it is obvious that Akbar's rule did not make any difference to their lives. Mahmud's treatment of the Hindus in the 16th century shows that the regime of every Muslim who ruled in India

from Mohammad bin Kasim in the early 8th century to the end of Muslim rule, in 1858, of whichever race, dynasty or nationality, and whatever his age, was to the Hindus a period of terror, torture, slavery, humiliation and great cruelty.

"On[13] October 22, 1573 Akbar had the ceremony of circumcision of the three princes performed with great eclat···In far off Mewar (in 1574) two districts Mohan and Rampura were renamed Islampur. Akbar also tried to set up Muslim colonies in the other districts therby giving large tracts to Muslims in Budhnor, Ruhlia Bavebra, Pur, and Bhimravar, (Shri Ram Sharma's Maharana Pratap, pp. 38-39.)"

"In September 1577 Akbar sent a party of Haj pilgrims with five lacs of rupees and 16,000 khilats to distribute among the residents of Hijaz (Abul Fazal's Akbarnama, Tr, Beveridge, III, 305-6...) Even Badayuni admits that the emperor sent many to Mecca with gold and goods and rich presents at considerable public expense. From this evidence it is impossible to give credence to the accusation of Badayuni and some others that Akbar was an apostate."

Badayuni being a dissatisfied courtier and a rabidly fanatic Muslim he couldn't tolerate Akbar's occasional highhandedness and the only way he could vent his spleen on a despot like Akbar, was to dub him a Hindu. That was the highest abuse that a lowly, subservient fanatic Muslim courtier like Badayuni could fling at an all-powerful despot like Akbar, with impunity.

13. Pp. 203-8, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat, ibid.

Akbar was so fanatic a Muslim that he used to convert not only men but also districts, towns temples and elephants to Islam.

Badayuni tells us[14] that Rana Pratap's elephant Ram Prasad which was presented to Akbar after the Haldighat battle was named Peer Prasad by Akbar.

Around 989 A. H.[15] "the emperor captured a sect of sheikhs, who called themselves 'disciples' but were generally known as Ilahis. They had invented similar names for the laws and religious commands of Islam and for the fast. His Majesty asked them whether they repented of their vanities. At his command they were sent to Bhakkar and Qandahar and were given to merchants in exchnge for Turkish colts." This instance proves that Akbar was such a fanatic Muslim that he would not suffer any para- Islamic sect to exist.

[16]When Shah Abu Turab and Itimadkhan Gujerati brought a piece of rock which they claimed bore Mohammad's foot impression Akbar went eight miles to receive it and commanded his courtiers to carry it by turns, a few steps each. In this manner they brought it to the city."

[17]"The 1,000 of the Hijra era being now on the point of completion, the emperor ordered a history of all kings of Islam to be written. "That, Akbar a ruler in Hindusthan should commemorate the

14. P. 243, Vol II Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.
15. P. 308, Vol II, ibid.
16. P. 320, ibid.
17. P. 327, ibid

1,000th year of the Hijra and cause a history of only Muslim rulers to be written is indicative of his Islamic fanaticism.

Akbar, like every other Muslim ruler, thirsted for Hindu blood. Badayuni says "I represented (to Akbar) that I had a very strong desire to take part in a holy war (i. e. massacring Hindus). 'I have the presumption to desire to dye these black moustachios and beard in (Hindu) blood (in the Rana Pratap war) through loyalty to Your Majesty's person' and when I put out my hand towards the couch in order to kiss his feet, he withdrew it, but just as I was going out of the audience chamber he called me back and filling both his hands he presented me with a sum of 50 Ashrafis, and bid me farewell."

Badayuni's statement that when out of loyalty to Akbar he expressed his yearning to dye his black Muslim moustachios in Hindu blood by massacring Hindus, Akbar far from expressing any disapprobation presented him a handful of gold coins shows how much premium Akbar put on massacring Hindus. This should disprove the claim that Akbar unlike other Muslim rulers was well disposed towards the Hindus. Akbar like every other medieval Muslim courtier and ruler deeply hated the Hindus.

In Akbar's time there was no let up in the persecution of the Hindus. They were treated as third-class citizens deserving of third degree methods. Evidence of this is found in the Ain-i

18. P. 234 ibid.

Akbari. Abul Fazal writes[19] "In the second year (of Akbar's reign), after the conquest of Mankot Akbar made Husayn Khan governor of Lahore. During his incumbancy (four months and four days) he showed himself a zealous Sunni. As the Christians did with the Jews, he ordered the Hindus as unbelievers to wear a patch (Tukra) near the shoulders, and thus got the nick name of Tukriya(patcher)."

That patch was obviously to mark the Hindus out as Pariahs so that even through inadvertance they may not get humane treatment. Such discrimination under which the mere Hindu was treated, worse than a dog or pig, was endemic throughout Muslim rule.

Many students, teachers and scholars of Indian history fed for generations on concocted stories of Akbar's fancied benevolent rule have at best had sneaking suspicions about the validity of traditional tutoring.

But even these people who doubt the authenticity of assertions about Akbar's impartial and humane rule still believe that though covertly a Hindu-hater overtly Akbar appeared to be very conciliatory.

This view is mistaken. Akbar neither comouflaged nor minimised his hatred for the Hindus, as is apparent from the instances quoted above.

19. P. 403, Ain-i Akbari, translated into English by H. Blochmann, edited by Lt. Col. D. C. Phillot, second edition, Calcutta, 1927.

Hindus were as openly despised, as contemptuously treated, humiliated and humbled and as cruelly treated under Akbar's rule as under any other Muslim's rule. There was not the slightest difference. Akbar was one of the many links in the chain of Muslim rule in India. That link was of a piece with the other links of the Muslim chain which fettered Hindusthan.

Chapter XIX

MALPRACTICES

Akbar's tyrannical, famine-stricken, revolt-ridden, war-worn and corrupt regime was based on some very cruel malpractices. These were an ancient legacy almost from the beginning of Muslim rule and lasted until Mogul power in Delhi ended. No blame should attach to Akbar for inventing those practices. But since he is sought to be built up as an ideal, noble, generous, considerate, merciful and tolerant monarch we wish to point out that all malpractices of Muslim rule continued at their worst during Akbar's rule. He neither abolished them nor softened their rigour.

One such malpractice was of the compulsory branding of all horses in the realm, to whomsoever they belonged, with the royal mark. This was not only usurpation of all horses in the realm but it automatically enslaved every person who owned a horse. The possessor of a branded horse became a servant of the crown liable to render military or other service without so much as being entitled to even a farthing in return. Whenever Akbar conquered any new territory all the ruthless malpractices that formed the basis of his rule were extended to the new territory. This is illustrated by the conquest of Gujerat. Vincent Smith says "Disturbances continued though the conquest of Gujerat was final... (During 1573-74) the emperor in concert with Raja

1. P. 86, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Todarmal, promulgated the branding regulation... a regular system of branding horses...based on Allauddin Khilji's and Sher Shah's practice."

The branding practice was deeply resented even by Akbar's own relations and wealthy courtiers. Smith remarks[2] "Mirza Aziz Koka, Akbar's favourite foster brother was so particularly hostile (to the branding of horses) that Akbar was obliged to confine him to his garden house at Agra."

Todarmal, a Hindu, became Akbar's hot favourite at court only because he permitted himself to be a stooge to ruthlessly enforce all of Akbar's malpractices throughout the realm. Since it was a Hindu who was enforcing those unconscionable practices on behalf of Akbar Hindus, who formed the vast majority of Akbar's subjects, found themselves between the devil and the deep sea.

[3]"The great Bengal revolt of 1580 was partly due to the resentment provoked by Akbar's insistence on the resumption of jagirs, the preparation of descriptive rolls, and the systematic branding of horses."

Badayuni records that "[4]Shahbaz Khan the Mir Baksh, introduced the custom and rule of Dagh-u-Mahall, which had been the rule of sultan Allauddin Khilji and afterwards the law under Sher Shah. It was settled that every Amir should commence as a commander of 20 and be ready with his followers to mount guard, carry messages, etc., as had been

2. P. 981 ibid.
3. P. 265, ibid.
4. Pp. 193-99, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

ordered and when according to the rule he had brought the horses of his 20 troopers to be branded, he was then to be made a commander of 100 or more. They were likewise to keep elephants and camels in proportion to their command according to the same rule. When they had brought to the muster their new contingent complete they were to be promoted according to their merits and circumstances to the post of commander of 1,000 or 2,000, or even 5,000, which is the highest command. But if they did not do well at the musters they were to be degraded···The condition of the soldiers grew worse because the Amirs put most of their servants and mounted attendants into soldiers' clothes (and) brought them to the musters. But when they got their jagirs they gave leave to their mounted attendants, and when a new emergency arose they mustered as many 'borrowed' soldiers as were required and sent them away again when they had served their purpose. Hence while the income and expenditure of the Mansabdars remained in status quo dust fell into the platter of the helpless soldier, so much so, that he was no longer fit for anything. But from all sides there came a lot of low tradespeople, weavers and cotton cleaners, carpenters and greengrocers, both Hindu and Musalman, who brought borrowed horses, got them branded, and were appointed to a command, or were made Kroris, or Ahades or Dakhilis to some one; and when a few days afterwards no trace was to be found of the imaginary horse and the visionary saddle they had to perform their duties on foot. Many times it happened at the cruel musters before the emperor himself in his special audience hall

that they were weighed in their clothes with their hands and feet tied, they were found to weigh from 2½ to three maunds more or less, and after inquiry it was found that they were all hired and that their very clothes and saddles were borrowed articles...Lo! all this in my day but ask no questions."

The horror of the above atrocious practice may well be imagined. Every man was reduced to serfdom. Each one became liable for military service. In addition he had to bring his own animals like horses and elephants and camels. Each one was also supposed to progressively enslave more and more men to be turned into soldiers. One who did not submit himself and scores of others to such military tutelage to ravage Hindusthan for the alien Muslim monarch was flogged, tortured and even killed. It was methods such as these that caused the spread of Islam and Islamic rule in India.

Since everyone was forced to enslave men and animals for the royal musters the persons aspiring to get some land and rank from Akbar had to resort to plunder of animals and kidnapping of the defenceless for being produced before Akbar. This gave rise to other malpractices such as bribery, theft, murders, massacres and torture. This proves that far from being kind and noble Akbar was one of the most ruthless and rapacious monarchs known to history.

Thus Akbar happened to be at the apex of a rapacious system based on tiers of big and small

tyrants who fleeced the common man and fed on his misery.

In the 23rd year of Akbar's accession arrived Sharif of Amul [5]"In his wanderings," says Badayuni, "he came to the Dakhin where from his want of self-restraint he betrayed the filthiness of his disposition and the rulers of the Dakhin (wanted to kill him) but he was only set on a donkey and shown about the city in disgrace. But Hindusthan is a wide place where there is an open place for all licentiousness and no one interferes with another's business so that everyone can do just as he pleases." Thus, according to Badayuni himself, under Muslim rule the whole of Hindusthan, whether the Deccan region or Northern India, was reduced to a place open for all licentiousness, and every Muslim could do just as he pleased.

It was a practice during Muslim rule in India to treat all prisoners rounded up after every campaign as slaves or massacre them. This same practice continued in all its rigour and fury even in Akbar's reign. We have already noted earlier how people were enslaved along with their pack animals and other live stock for military service. Ralph Fitch, an English traveller who visited Agra and Fathepur Sikri during Akbar's time says "I kept William Leedes the jeweller with the King Zelabdim Echebar (Jalaluddin Akbar) in Fatehpore, who did entertain him very well, and gave him an house and five slaves." Though at times even Muslims rounded up after a revolt was quelled were treated

5. Pp. 252-53, ibid.

as slaves the majority of slaves throughout Muslim rule in India, including that of Akbar, were Hindus. This human stock, like animal stock[6] used to be assigned for any menial or immoral duties at the pleasure of the sovereign or his courtiers.

Referring to Akbar's discussions on various subjects with his courtiers Badayuni says "The first of these questions which the emperor asked in these days was (A.H. 983) "How many free-born women (i.e. Muslim) may a man legally marry by Nikah? The lawyers answered that four was the limit fixed by the prophet. The emperor thereupon remarked that in early youth he had married any number of women he pleased, both free born (i.e. Muslim) and slaves (i.e. Hindu)." This observation proves that Akbar kept innumerable Hindus—both men and women—as slaves to be apportioned at his will between himself, his guests and courtiers for immoral purposes or menial service.

[7]A large number of Shaikhs and fakirs were sent to other places, mostly to Qandahar, where they were exchanged for horses...The emperor captured a sect of Sheikhs...At Akbar's command they were sent to Bhakkar and Qandahar and were given to merchants to exchange for Turkish colts."

Another sinister practice was Akbar's insistence that vanquished adversaries send choice women from their entourage and families to Akbar's harem.

6. P. 211, ibid.
7. P. 308, ibid.

Akbar also took as hostages one or more relations of defeated adversaries. The latter were also required to prostrate themselves in abject subjection everytime they were ushered into the royal presence.

Most of these practices originated from the earliest Muslim invaders. Over the centuries they were perfected, sharpened and imposed with ruthless efficiency. During Akbar's time the rigour of those malpractices was abominable. Akbar was truly the greatest among those who perfected all cruel practices.

REVOLTS GALORE

Every aspect of Akbar's character was so revolting that practically all his male relations including his son, Jehangir alias Salim, and courtiers revolted against him. The whole of his reign was marked by unending revolts, besides interminable wars.

Vincent Smith remarks[1] "Akbar usually had a rebellion somewhere or the other on his hands and the unrecorded outbreaks of disorder in the provinces, summarily dealt with by the faujdars, must have been innumerable."

Dr. Shrivastava notes that[2] "The vast empire hardly ever enjoyed complete immunity from some kind of disturbance or rebellion. Some chief or other taking advantage of slackness of administration, lack of vigilance...or the occurrance of a natural calamity raised his head in revolt. It is tedious to recount cases of civil disturbance. One important example will suffice. In February 1590, while one day riding a female elephant, which was attacked by a ferocious male companion, Akbar fell to the ground, received serious injury in the face and became unconscious. Rumours spread about the seriousness of the injury and po[ssi]bly of his death, which caused revolts in distant parts of

1. P. 276, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.
2. P. 381, ibid.

the country, and many parganas were plundered by turbulent people. Some Shaikhawat Rajputs plundered the pargana of Bairat in Alwar district, and some others laid their hands on Rewari in the modern Gurgaon district of the Punjab. Shahbaz Khan the collector of Bairat, finding himself powerless, fled to Koil (Aligarh). Another set of men under one Diala (Dipayal) invaded the country near the city of Meerut."

Had Akbar been the generous, just and kind ruler that he is often made out to be, peace and contentment should have prevailed during his lifetime, and on his death his subjects should have looked upon his children with passionate devotion, hope, love and respect. Instead rumours of Akbar's death unleashed the pent up seething discontent of the public. It was only Akbar's cruel and ruthless measures, which were the despair of everybody from princes to paupers, which prevented them from overthrowing Akbar. They all wished that Akbar died or was killed.

To give the reader an idea of the seriousness and continuity of revolts throughout Akbar's reign we reproduce below relevant passages from a cross section of historians who have written on Akbar.

Vincent Smith says[3] "Khwaja Muazzam, half brother of Akbar's mother was turbulent and was guilty of many [mu]rders and other offences... Akbar crossed the Jum[n]a as if for hunting... Khwaja Muazzam was attacked, arrested and ducked in the river alone. He did not drown, and was sent to prison in Gwalior fort, where he died insane."

3. P. 49, ibid.

It may be noted that 'hunting' is not to be taken at its face value. Throughout Muslim history the word 'hunting' is used not to indicate hunting of animals but of all Hindus, and some Muslim rebels.

[4]"In July 1564 Abdulla Khan Uzbek, successor of Peer Mohammad (governor) in Malwa revolted and Akbar had to organize an expedition. Akbar conquered Mandu and drove Abdulla into Gujerat."

[5]"The pleasant life at Nagarchain lodge was interrupted by the news that Mohammad Hakim prince of Kabul had invaded the Punjab. Khan Zaman recited the khutba in his name. Towards the end of February (1567) Akbar arrived at Lahore but his brother had already retired across the Indus... Intelligence having been received of the rebellion of the nobles commonly called Mirzas... distant relatives of Akbar...it was necessary to quit the Punjab and return to Agra..."

[6]"At the beginning of May 1567 Akbar left Agra in order to deal finally with the rebellion of Khan Zaman. The rebel chiefs given over to drunkenness and debauchery had no sentries posted. In the battle which ensued Khan Zaman was killed and his brother Bahadur was taken prisoner and beheaded... Several leaders were executed by being trampled to death by elephants. (The fight took place in a village of Allahabad district). An order

4. P. 53, ibid.
5. P. 56, ibid.
6. P. 57, ibid.

was issued that whoever brought in a Mogul rebel's head should get a gold mohar, and whoever brought a Hindusthani's head should get a rupee." This shows how the head of one belonging to Hindusthan was rated much cheaper than that of an alien Mogul. Because residents of India were being killed everyday in their thousands on some pretext or the other.

[7]"Just about this time (1572 end) it was heard that Ibrahim Mirza had murdered a person of distinction named Rustam Khan, and was meditating further misdeeds. Surat was the chief stronghold of the Mirzas. Akbar, then near Baroda, decided to march against the enemy. When he came near the fort of the Mahi he learned that the enemy was holding Sarnal, a small town on the other side five miles to the east of Thasra. Bhupat the brother of Bhagwandas was slain. Victorious Akbar returned to his camp on December 24."

[8]"Soon after Akbar's return from Gujerat, rebellion broke out under the leadership of Mohammad Husain one of the irrepressible Mirzas, and a chief named Ikhtiyarul Mulk. Akbar's army little more than a loosely organized militia had been exhausted and the equipment was worn out. It was necessary, therefore, to equip the fresh expedition from imperial funds. On August 23, 1573 he was ready and rode out. Within 11 days he covered a distance of 600 miles. The battle of Ahmedabad was fought on September 2, 1573. Mohammad Husain Mirza was taken prisoner.

7. Pp. 79-80, ibid.
8. P. 185, ibid.

Ikhtiyarul Mulk was slain. The Mirza was decapitated. In accordance with the gruesome custom of the times, a pyramid was built with the heads of the rebels, more than 2,000 in number. Shah Mirza became a homeless wanderer."

Describing the discontentment in Bihar and Bengal Smith says[9] "Special cases of severity to individuals increased the ill-feeling, and it is said that the officials added fuel to the fire by greed for money. The influential chiefs of Bengal revolted in 1580 January. In April 1580 Muzaffar Khan of Tanda was captured and killed with all sorts of tortures. Akbar dared not go in person to quell the disturbances... By 1584 the rebellion had been generally suppressed. Rebel leaders were punished in diverse ways."... Akbar never felt any scruple about ordering the private, informal execution or assassination of opponents who could not be executed publicly."

[10] "The leader of the conspiracy at court was Shah Mansur the Finance Minister. Letters from him to Mohammad Hakim (Akbar's half brother who ruled in Kabul) were intercepted. (Akbar prepared to crush the conspiracy by a combination of guile and force) Shah Mansur was finally imprisoned and was hanged on the strength of evidence partially forged)... On February 8, 1581 Akbar marched from Fatehpur Sikri. At Shahbad, midway between Thaneshwar and Ambala, on a tree adjoining Kot Kachhwaha Shah Mansur was solemnly hanged."

9. Pp. 132-35, ibid.
10. P. 137, ibid.

[11] Akbar intended to send an embassy to Europe. He deputed Sayyid Muzaffar to accompany Father Monserrate for the embassy. Muzaffar once away from the court, deserted and hid himself in the Deccan.

[12] "Muzaffar continued to give trouble in the wild regions of Kathiawar and Cutch until 1591-92 when he was captured. He is reported to have committed suicide by slashing his own throat."

[13] "In August 1592 Akbar started on his second visit to Kashmir...He received news that a nephew of his governor in the valley had rebelled and set up as sultan on his own account...(but soon thereafter the rebel's head was brought for Akbar's inspection)."

[14] "Asirgarh marked the waning of Akbar's fortunate star. His conquests had been practically continuous for 45 years. His remaining years were few and evil. In view of Jehangir's rebellion Akbar returned to Agra (from Asirgarh) probably early in May 1601. Prince Salim's prolonged rebellion, prince Daniyal's death and other events saddened the closing years of Akbar's life. (Salim while in rebellion sought the support of the Portuguese and their ammunition against his father and) did his best to persuade them that he was sincerely devoted to the Christian religion. He even sent an envoy to Goa asking that priests might be accredited to his rival court at Allahabad. He

11. P. 147, ibid.
12. Pp. 148-9, ibid.
13. P. 178, ibid.
14. Pp. 207-222, ibid.

subscribed his letters with the sign of the cross, and round his neck wore a locket containing portraits of Jesus and Mary... Throughout the year 1602 Salim continued to hold court at Allahabad and to maintain royal state as king of the provinces which he had usurped. He emphasized his claim to royalty by striking both gold and copper money, specimens of which he had the impudence to send to his father. He sent his adherent Dost Mohammad of Kabul as his envoy to negotiate with Akbar. Dost Mohammad remained at Agra for six months. His conditions were that Salim should be permitted to visit his father at the head of 70,000 men, that all his grants to his officers be confirmed, and that his adherents should not be regarded as rebels... On August 12, 1602 early in the morning Abul Fazal was attacked, as he was about to make the day's march, by Bir Singh, the Bundela chieftain of Orchha, whom Salim had hired for the purpose. Abul Fazal was transfixed by a lance and promptly decapitated. His head was sent to Allahabad, where Salim received it with unholy joy and treated with shameful insult. (Abul Fazal was murdered near Serai Barar, 10 or 12 miles from Narwar)"

[15]"It is certain that Salim ardently desired his father's demise.""

[16]"Jehangir's rebellion if successful, must have resulted in his parent's death."

About the numerous rebellions during Akbar's reign Dr. Shrivastava says "[17]Khan-i-Zaman deput-

15. P. 234, ibid.
16. P. 237, ibid.
17. P. 101, Akbar the Great, ibid

ed Bahadur and Iskander to ravage and plunder the parganas of Surharpur near Faizabad, (Khan-i-Zaman one of Akbar's generals, was in revolt)."

It was during this rebellion that some more sacred Hindu temples in Ayodhya, the capital of Lord Rama, were desecrated and converted into mosques by the Muslims.

"[18]During the Uzbek rebellion Sher Mohammad Diwana taking advantage of the confusion revolted."

"[19]The rebellious Mirzas proceeded to the neighbourhood of Delhi plundering the country."

"[20]Mohammad Amin Diwan, an important officer, shot an arrow at a Faujdar, and was, therefore, ordered to be put to death. His life was spared on the intercession of some courtiers. But he was ordered to be beaten up and so he fled."

"[21]Junaid Karrani, another officer, fled from Hindaun, his assignment, to Gujerat. Khan Zaman again set up the standard of revolt on hearing that Mirza Hakim was on the march to Lahore."

"[22]On August 30, 1567 Akbar proceeded on a hunting expedition with the double purpose of suppressing the rebellion of the Mirzas in Malwa and of conquering Chittor."

18. P. 104, ibid.
19. P. 106, ibid.
20. P. 107, ibid.
21. Pp. 107-8, ibid.
22. P.113, ibid

Above is a clear indication of how historians have failed in understanding and interpreting Muslim chronicles. Dr. Shrivastava first asserts that Akbar started on a hunting expedition, and then mentions two objects which have nothing to do with animal hunting. Hence we wish to caution all students of Muslim chronicles that the term 'hunting' should be understood to mean 'waging war.'

A proper understanding of fraudulent, chauvinistic and fawning Muslim chronicles cannot be had from the superficial meaning of the words. They need a special key. For example, the term 'destroyed temples and built mosques' only means that Hindus were ousted from their temples and mansions and the same buildings were used as mosques and tombs. That is why all mediaeval mosques and tombs in India look like Hindu temples and mansions. Similarly a Muslim's marriage with a Hindu woman must be understood to be a case of kidnapping and the word dowry should be taken to mean ransom as seen by us in Bharmal's case.

After conquering Gujerat "[23]Akbar resolved to extirpate the Mirzas who had seized a considerable part of Gujerat. When the siege of Surat was in progress Ibrahim Husain Mirza attempted to make a surprise attack on Agra...Mirza Sharfuddin Husain, a former governor of Nagour and Ajmer (who had helped Akbar in kidnapping the Jaipur ruler Bharmal's daughter for the royal harem) and an inveterate rebel who had fled from the court in

24. Pp. 137 , ibid.

1562 and joined the rebellious Mirzas was arrested and brought to the court at Surat on March 4,1573. He was thrown before the feet of an elephant but his life was spared and he was kept in prison. Even Saint Khwaja Abdus Shahid's appeal to set the Mirza free was rejected."

That shows how Akbar's own henchmen who undertook fearful raids on Hindu kingdoms to kidnap Hindu women for Akbar's harem, themselves got disgusted with Akbar's treacherous dealings and revolted against him. It also shows how even panders and ravagers were recommended for leniency by Muslim fakirs. Another pertinent fact is that Sharfuddin's revolt lasted for eleven long years before he could be brought to book.

"[24]Ibrahim Husain Mirza retreating to Sambhal and the Punjab was ruthlessly devastating territory."

"[25]Gujerat had not been completely subdued when Akbar left Ahmedabad (April 1573). Ikhtiyar-ul-Mulk supported by Raja Narayandas of Idar (Father-in-law of Rana Pratap) and the sons of Sher Khan Fauladi was in veiled rebellion. Mohammad Husain Mirza, who returned from Daulatabad, as soon as Akbar's back was turned, joined the rebels."

"[26]Among other things Muzaffar Khan opposed the regulation of branding of horses and was consequently dismissed from the Prime Minister's post."

24. P. 143, ibid.
25. Pp. 145-150, ibid.
26. P. 151, ibid.

"[27]"Mirza Aziz Koka had failed to maintain the fixed number of cavalry in his services to bring them to the muster and have his horses branded. Akbar, therefore, had him arrested and degraded. He used unbecoming expressions about the reforms. Aziz Koka was Akbar's foster brother. He was set free in 1578 after apologizing."

Shahbaz Khan a general engaged in the campaign against Rana Pratap, "[28]was recalled sometime in 1580 for despatch to Bihar and Bengal where the Mogul officers were in rebellion."

[29]"Raja Madhukar, elder brother of Bir Singh Dev Bundela and ruler of Orchha was in rebellion. Akbar sent an army under Sadiq Khan to reduce him to submission. After a brave and stubborn resistance he submitted (in May 1577). He however revolted again and continued to give trouble till his death in 1592 A.D.

"[30]Sheikh Abdun Nabi who had enjoyed great ascendancy in Akbar's mind for over 10 years fell into disfavour about the end of January 1578. At the end of 1578 Abdun Nabi, was dismissed and replaced as chief Sadar by Sultan Khwaja who had returned from Mecca. Towards the end of 1579 Abdun Nabi was exiled to Mecca against his will. On return to India in 1583 he died in suspicious circumstances." Obviously he was murdered at Akbar's behest.

27. P. 188, ibid.
28. P. 220, ibid.
29. P. 230 ibid.
30. Pp. 231-232, ibid.

"[31]Early in 1580 Akbar had to face a widespread rebellion of his officers and troops in Bihar and Bengal. It started almost simultaneously in the two provinces . (while) the rebellion in the eastern provinces was in progress and some active courtiers at Fatehpur Sikri who were in collusion with the rebels formed a plot the object of which was to kill Akbar, proclaim Mirza Hakim as the ruler, and march to join the rebels in Bengal. The plot leaked out, the conspirators were imprisoned and the chief among them, Miraki, was put to death.

[32] In Bengal "the victorious rebels proclaimed Mirza Hakim as their ruler, and recited the khutba in his name. Mirza Sharfuddin, an arch rebel and a former governor of Nagaur and Ajmer who was kept a captive in the fort of Tanda and had managed to secure his release on April 19, 1581 was elected leader of the rebels. The real leaders were however Masum Khan Kabuli and Baba Khan Qaqshal."

"[33] Azad Khan Turkoman was deputed to Jaunpur to arrest and bring to court Mulla Mohammad Yazdi and Mir Muazzul Mulk, who were spreading religious disaffection against the emperor. The order was speedily executed, and the boat in which they were being conducted was sunk, most probably, deliberately in the Yamuna near Etawah, and the two rebels were drowned ."

"Encouraged by the news of Mirza Hakim's start to invade India, Masum Farankhudi, who

31. Pp. 268-273, ibid.
32. P. 274, ibid.
33. Pp. 276-278 ibid.

had for some time secretly entertained seditious ideas, openly unfurled the flag of rebellion in Jaunpur. In the campaign undertaken against him, he was forced to leave his family and treasure in the fort of Ayodhya. Shahbaz Khan occupied the fort and the city the next day. Akbar mercifully ordered Shahbaz Khan (the royal commander) not to molest the family and dependents of the rebel."

The fort of Ayodhya was Lord Rama's citadel and a place sacred to the Hindus. It was desecrated in Akbar's time for the umpteenth time by Muslim invaders. All mediaeval mosques in Ayodhya are ancient temples and mansions hallowed by the divine incarnation, Lord Rama.

Akbar's special instruction that the enemy's women should not be molested, is clear evidence that in all other campaigns Akbar's troopers had not only a licence but were specially encouraged to molest women of the rival side. The exception made in this case indicates that Akbar wanted some of the captured women for his own harem.

"[34]During the period when Akbar was proceeding against Mirza Hakim, a rebellion occurred in Katehr now known as Rohilkhand."

"[35]Masum Khan Farankhudi sought the protection of Akbar's mother (March 1582) but one night while on the way from the palace he was assassinated."

34. P. 285, ibid.
35. P. 290, ibid.

"[36]Bahadur (son of Said Khan Badakshi) who had assumed the title of king, and made Tirhut his capital, was compelled to sue for peace and was put to death by Akbar's orders."

"Shahbaz Khan who had for a few years held the high post of chief Bakshi (army minister) and had rendered conspicuous military service, being guilty of insolent behaviour was put under arrest and kept in custody."

"[37]After his success (against the Bengal rebels) the Khan-i-Azam begged to be relieved of his duty. The rebellion of 1580-83 constituted a great danger to Akbar and the Mugal empire. It was widespread rising not confined to Bihar as is generally supposed, but also embraced, besides those two provinces, most of Orissa, the districts of Ghazipur and Banaras, the provinces of Allahabad, and Awadh, and modern Rohilkhand. Some of the ministers and topmost courtiers were involved."

"[38]Gujerati noble Aitimad Khan had thrown his lot with the Gujerati rebels and was, therefore, sent to jail. The important province of Gujerat witnessed another rebellion in 1583."

"[39]The restless Jalala returned from Transoxania early in 1592 and once again rallied in Tirah the wild Afridi and Urkzai tribesmen under his rebellious standards. On March 11, Akbar was obliged to depute the Kabul and frontier forces

36. P. 291, ibid.
37. Pp. 293-294 ibid.
38. Pp. 319-20, ibid.
39. Pp. 347-49, ibid.

under Kasim Khan and Asaf Khan respectively to put down the Raushaniya rising. Kakiani and Mahmudzai clans also joined the revolt. The revolt was suppressed. But Wahadat Ali a relation of Jalala held his own at the fort Kanshali. The tribal revolt continued even beyond 1600 A. D."

On [40]"Nov. 16, 1586 Raja Basu of Mau alias Nurpur came and did homage. Although he had submitted to Akbar long before, yet when the royal army had suffered a reverse in the frontier region he felt disposed to revolt. Accordingly an army was sent against him."

Dr. Shrivastava and several other historians are wrong in stating that "Bharmal came and submitted to Akbar, Raja Ramchandra came and submitted, Raja Basu came and submitted", and so on. This misleads the reader into believing that Akbar had some irresistible attraction and unique lustre which sent ruler after Hindu ruler voluntarily and irresistibly hurtling towards Akbar, like moths hurrying towards a light. It was just the opposite. Akbar was a great repeller. All looked upon him with great loathing, hatred and disgust. So, what is insinuated to be voluntary submission had behind it a gruesome and ruthless campaign of cruel plunder, massacre, rape, arson and desecration of shrines. It is an insult to the bravery of India's gallant Rajput rulers who fought the Muslim invaders for 1,000 long years and ultimately rendered them impotent, to insinuate that they submitted to Akbar out of love for him or just for fun. The most glaring instance is that of Bharmal

40. P. 358, ibid.

the ruler of Jaipur. While he was reduced to humiliating submission and made to surrender the chastity of his beloved, innocent daughter along with a huge ransom because of repeated terror raids most accounts have fraudulently glorified it as a great honour conferred on Bharmal by a condescending and patronizing Akbar.

[41]"During Mansingh's absence at Agra a fresh rebellion occurred in Bengal. (Mansingh returned in 1599 and undertook a prolonged campaign. He routed the Afghans in 1601 February by which time the Bengal rebellion had practically come to an end)."

[42]"Another rebellion occurred in Bhatha or Baghelkhand. Akbar's prolonged absence from his capital gave an opportunity to the ruler of Bhatha (modern Rewa) to assert his independence.

[43]"During Akbar's absence in the Deccan in 1600-1 Raja Basu of Mau in the Bari Doab of the Punjab, the Raja of Jammu, and some other chiefs of the north western region revolted, and powerful contingents of troops had to be sent. The chiefs of Lakhanpur, Jasrota, Mankot, Ramgarh and Kobast in the mountainous tracts of the Punjab also revolted in 1602. They had to be suppressed with powerful forces."

[44]"on July 22, 1592 Akbar started on his second visit to Kashmir. At this time Kashmir was dis-

41. PP. 376-78.
42. P. 381, ibid.
43. Pp. 383-387, ibid.
44. Pp. 387-95. ibid

tracted by a local rebellion, and the emperor's visit was probably undertaken to overawe the rebel Yadgar into submission."

It was during his Kashmir visits that Akbar destroyed the famous and magnificent Verinag temple near the source of the Jhelum river, and several other Hindu shrines which dotted Kashmir. By a cruel irony the Kashmir archaeology department ascribes to Akbar the construction of the very buildings that he ravaged and razed to the plinth level and reduced to their present state of gaping ruins.

[45]"Mirza Aziz Koka, Akbar's foster brother (who) did not see eye to eye with Akbar, secretly prepared to leave for Hedjaz and set out for Diu under the pretext of making an attempt to capture it from the Portuguese (March 25, 1592). He embarked on a ship with his wives, six sons and six daughters. He was shamelessly fleeced by the priests in the temple of Kaba in Mecca." Finding life unbearable he returned torn between the devil and the deep sea.

[46]"The Ahmadnagar people were so exasperated against the Mugals that they plundered some of the Mugal baggage when the Moguls began retreating on March 20 (1596 A.D.)."

The later years of Akbar's life were tormented by the insubordination of his sons. The eldest of them, Prince Salim (the future emperor Jehangir), had himself proclaimed king in Allahabad. Earlier

45. Pp. 394-5, ibid.
46. P. 432, ibid

he had unsuccessfully tried to poison and kill Akbar. Thus throughout Akbar's whole life he was regarded as public enemy No. 1 by almost all his courtiers, generals, vassals, and even his own sons. When such preponderating evidence is available it is an academic crime to glorify Akbar as 'great'. The souls of the multitudes whom Akbar tormented and tortured must be writhing in dumb agony at the academic insult flung at them in the form of Akbar's glorification.

BUILDINGS

Akbar is said to have built a number of forts and palaces and founded many towns. This is as big a hoax played on a gullible world by a succession of Muslim chroniclers as the one projecting a cruel and fanatic Akbar as a noble and liberal ruler. It will be proved in this chapter that all those palaces, forts and townships are of ancient Hindu origin. They existed centuries before Akbar was even born, and were merely occupied by him as the heir to Babur's acquisitions in India.

Fatehpur Sikri

Twenty three miles to the southwest of Agra is a township called Fatehpur Sikri. The ancient Hindu capital SIKRI when captured by the Muslims was renamed 'Fathpur.' And since' Fathpur' means only a 'captured town' it was called 'Fatehpur SIKRI. It has a massive defensive wall around it. The walls enclose a very large plain and a hillock. On the hillock there are magnificent redstone gateways and a majestic palace complex. They are purely in the Hindu, Rajput style.

It is these beautiful royal buildings and their towering gateways which have been blatantly palmed off as the creations of Akbar, the third-generation Mogul ruler in India.

There are innumerable references even in Muslim chronicles to the existence of Fatehpur Sikri reaching back into many centuries before Akbar. What is more Fatehpur Sikri has often been referred to as the royal headquarters of many Hindu and Muslim monarchs preceding Akbar.

At the outset we wish to make it clear that in the chronicles we are going to quote hereafter Fatehpur Sikri is at times referred to as only Fatehpur or as Sikri. Any of the three names Sikri, Fathpur or Fatehpur Sikri have been used to indicate the township of which the hillock, bedecked with beautiful Hindu redstone palaces, forms the focal point and the dominating feature.

A clear indication that all those three names are synonymous is given by the Muslim chronicler Yahya Bin Ahmad in his Tarikh-iMubarak Shahi. He says that[1] "by order of the Sultan the family and dependents (of Mohammad Khan, son of Auhad Khan ruler of Bayana, who had surrendered Bayana fort) were brought out of the fortress and sent to Delhi (on 12th November 1426 i. e. 130 years before Akbar ascended the throne). Bayana was given to Mukul Khan. Sikri, which is now known as Fathpur was entrusted to Malik Khairuddin Tuhfa."

Before Muslim occupation Fatehpur Sikri used to be an independent principality or a provincial headquarters according as its fortune changed. But the origin of the redstone palace complex with its towering gateways reaches into the dim past of

1. P. 62, Vol IV, Elliot & Dowson.

Hindu history. Testifying to this Lt. Col. James Todd, a noted historian, says[2] "(Rana Sangram Singh) came to the Mewar throne in 1509 A.D. Eighty thousand horse, seven Rajas of the highest rank, nine Raos and 104 chieftains, bearing the titles of Rawal and Rawut with 500 elephants followed him into the field (against the Mogul invader Babur). The princes of Marwar and Amber did him homage, and the Raos of Gwalior, Ajmer, SIKRI, Raisen, Kalpee, Chanderi, Boondi, Gagrown Rampura and Aboo served him as tributaries. . ."

The above passage makes it clear that during the time of Akbar's grandfather, Babur the Fatehpur Sikri principality was ruled over by a Rao (Rajput chieftain) who owed allegiance to Rana Sangramsingh of Mewar. The redstone palace complex which modern visitors are made to believe as Akbar's creation, was the residence of the Rajput Rao centuries before Akbar.

Tracing the origin of Rajputs of the Sikarwal clan Col. Todd says[3] "They have their name from the town of Sikri (Futtehpoor) which was formerly an independent principality." Sikarwal Rajputs are a very ancient clan whose origins reach into the hoary immemorial past. They did not originate in the post-Akbar period since the Rao of Sikri had fought against Akbar's grandfather Babur. It should, therefore, be clear that the Sikarwal Rajputs lived in the redstone palace complex in Fatehpur Sikri several centuries before Akbar.

2. P. 240, Vol. I, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan.
3. P. 97, ibid.

Another reference to Fatehpur Sikri is of July 1405 which is 151 years before Akbar's accession. It says [4]"In the first charge Ikbal Khan was defeated and fled. He was pursued and his horse fell upon him and wounded him, so that he could not escape He was killed and his head was sent to Fatehpur." This was in the time of Sultan Mahmud. Such decapitated heads were hung on gateways to scare potential rebels. This indicates, therefore, that the towering gateway of Fatehpur Sikri, known as Buland Darwaza existed even 151 years before Akbar. The significance of sending the severed head, of all places, to Fatehpur Sikri was that it was the royal residence generations before Akbar, having been conquered by Muslim invaders from the Rajputs who were the creators and builders of the magnificent palace complex there.

At another place it is stated that [5]"Khizr Khan (the founder of the Sayyad dynasty) remained in Fathpur and did not go to Delhi." Khizr Khan Sayyad ascended the throne in May 1414. This reference to Fatehpur Sikri is of 42 years prior to Akbar's accession. Since Khizr Khan soon became the sultan it is clear that Fatehpur Sikri had palatial buildings generations before Akbar.

Babur the grandfather of Akbar testifies to the palaces at Fatehpur Sikri, about 27 years before Akbar's coronation and 13 years before Akbar's

4. P. 40, Vol. IV Elliot & Dowson.
5. P. 44, ibid.

birth. Babur says "In Agra alone, and of stone-cutters belonging to that place only, I everyday employed on my palaces 680 persons; and in Agra, SIKRI, Bayana, Dhulpur, Gwalior and Koel, there were employed on my works 1491 stone-cutters".

From Babur's own mouth we have the admission that in Agra, SIKRI, Bayana, Dhulpur, Gwalior and Koel (now known as Aligarh) there were several palaces all equally magnificent. This clearly means that the redstone palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri is an ancient Hindu building occupied by Muslim invaders.

Babur conquered Fatehpur Sikri after defeating Rana Sanga's Hindu army in the plains around Fatehpur Sikri. Historians mistakenly believe that this decisive battle was fought 10 miles away at Kanwaha alias Kanua. The engagement at Kanwaha was between the advance columns of Rana Sanga and Babur. A large reservoir of water several miles in circumference used to exist outside the elephant gateway of Fatehpur Sikri. That reservoir supplied water to the Fatehpur Sikri township and the large herd of elephants maintained by the pre-Muslim Rajput rulers in Fatehpur Sikri. Babur observes [7]"There being a large tank on our left, I encamped there to have the benefit of the water. . . . [8]It occurred to me, situated as I was, of all places in the neighbour-

6. P. 223, Tuzak-i-Babari, Vol. IV, Elliot and Dowson.
7. P. 268, Vol. IV, Elliot & Dowson, ibid.
8. P. 267, ibid.

hood, SIKRI being that in which water was most abundant was upon the whole the most desirable station for a camp.

[9]"When it was Abdul Aziz's day, without taking any precautions he advanced as far as Kanwaha which is five kos from SIKRI. The Pagans (i.e. Rana Sanga's Hindu army) were on the march forward, When they got notice of his imprudent and disorderly advance, which they no sooner learned than a body of 4000-5000 of them at once pushed on and fell upon him. On the very first charge a number of Abdul Aziz's men were taken prisoner and carried off the field. I then detached Mohmnerd Jang Jang to cover their retreat. . . . (The enemy) had reduced Abdul Aziz and his detachment to great straits."

It is clear from the above passage that the engagement fougnt at Kanwaha alias Kanua was not between the main bodies of Babur's and Rana Sanga's armies but between small detachments of both and that Babur's Muslim detachment was routed. Students of Indian history have, therefore, been grossly misled by their text books which assert that Rana Sanga was defeated at Kanwaha.

It is commonly believed that mediaeval battles were fought in open fields or bare plains. This is a gross error in the understanding of mediceval history. This error has crept into Indian histories because authors of those books have been perhaps mere academicians who have neither experienced warfare nor have made any study of it.

9. P. 267, ibid.

Mediaeval battles have always been fought across massive walls and bastions. Even modern wars are fought across barricades. An army encampment is always 'sheltered' by an embankment, barricade, thrown up earthwork, bunkers etc. The three decisive battles fought at Panipat in 1526, 1556 and 1761 were fought there because in all the three cases the defenders had entrenched themselves behind the heavily fortified township, palaces and citadel of Panipat. Magnificent gateways, isolated bastions, pavilions and ruined fortifications may still be seen testifying to the destruction wrought in those three important battles and innumerable raids and engagements during 1000—year long Muslim invasions and revolts.

The battle of Kanwaha was no exception. On his march towards Fatehpur, Sikri which was then owned by Rana Sanga, he had encamped at Kanwaha because there he had a palace and a fort. Such fortifications and royal residences existed at every few miles during Rajput rule. Even after a millenium of destruction by invading Muslim armies such palaces and citadels may still be seen at Kanwaha, Fatehpur Sikri, Bharatpur, Bayana, Dholpur, Agra, Gwalior—all within a few miles of one another.

Testifying to the existence of a palace at Kanwaha Tod says [10]"Rana Sanga was of middle stature. . . . He was celebrated for energetic enterprise, of which his capture of Muzaffar, king of

10. Pp. 246-59, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan. ibid

Malwa in his own capital is a celebrated instance. . He erected a small palace at Kanua."

Like the engagement at Kanua where Rana Sanga was entrenched behind the massive walls of his citadel the final decisive battle between his army and that of Babur was fought when Rana Sanga was camping on the Fatehpur Sikri hill inside its battlemented walls and palace complex. Babur was camping outside those walls near the lake.

We have already quoted Babur to say that his camp was close to Sikri and the reservoir. We now quote another passage from his Memoirs which says [11]"The battle was fought within view of a small hill near our camp. On this hill I directed a tower of the skulls of the infidels to be constructed".

[12]"When Adil Khan and Khawas Khan reached Fatehpur Sikri they went to visit Sheikh Salim one of the holy men of the age. This reference" again is of a time when Akbar was yet unborn.

[13]"The Mir died at Sikri," says Yahya Bin Abdul Latif, "in A. H. 971 (1563 A.D.)" This was only seven years after Akbar's accession and refers to a period when the founding of Sikri was not even contemplated even according to the traditional fraudulent accounts.

[14]"After this Sultan Mahmud the son of Sultan

11. P. 272, Vol. IV, Elliot & Dowson.
12. P. 483, ibid.
13. P. 294, ibid.
14. P. 346 ibid.

Sikandar, whom Hasan Khan Mewati and Rana Sanga had set up as king, engaged the 2nd Jamshed, the Emperor Babur in an action near Sikri... "This refers to Fatehpur Sikri two generations before Akbar who is supposed to have founded Fatehpur Sikri.

[15]"When Sher Shah marched from the capital of Agra, and arrived at Fatehpur Sikri he ordered that each division of the army should march together in order of battle." Sher Shah ruled from 1540 to 1545, i.e. his reign commenced two years before Akbar was born and it ended when Akbar was only three years old. Akbar was at that time in Afghanistan and yet Fatehpur Sikri existed in India.

[16]"Adil Khan went, accompanied by his nobles, to his brother (Islam Shah, son of Sher Shah). When he reached Fatehpur Sikri, Islam Shah came forth to meet him in the village of Singarpur." This reference to Fatehpur Sikri is of a time when even Akbar's father Humayun had not returned to India after his exile.

Innumerable such references to Fatehpur Sikri reach back into the dim centuries before Akbar.

The reason why Akbar left Agra for Fatehpur Sikri was his fear of being murdered. He, therefore, thought it prudent to shift his capital to Fatehpur Sikri which had all those palaces built by the Rajputs before the advent of the Muslims in India. Those palaces had been the haunt of

15. P. 404, ibid.
16. P. 481, ibid.

Sheikh Salim Chisti and his entourage. When Akbar decided to make Fatehpur Sikri his capital Sheikh Salim Chisti very unwillingly made room for him.

Giving the reason for Akbar's quitting Agra as the capital, the chronicler Ferishta says [17]"Akbar much incensed came to the resolution of depriving him (i.e. Behram Khan) of office. Some authors mention a scheme suggested to the king by his nurse (Maham Anaga) to get possession of the seals; while other says, that she discovered it was the protector (Behram Khan's) design to seize and confine him, a plot she is stated to have accidentally overheard, in a conversation between Behram Khan and the queen dowager. This, they say was the cause which determined Akbar to quit Agra."

Ferishta thus gives us a clear and cogent reason why Akbar moved his court from Agra to Fatehpur Sikri. Agra being an ancient seat of government it was full of senior and powerful nobles who were privy to Bheram Khan. At this time Akbar was only an adolescent. He had fallen out with his guardian Behram Khan. Therefore fearing that he might be done to death by his piqued guardian Akbar moved from Agra to Fatehpur Sikri so that he could be sure who his real adherents were. It was not for nothing, as traditional accounts would have us believe, that Akbar suddenly thought of 'building' a new Fatehpur Sikri and as suddenly leaving it.

17. P. 121, Vol. II, Ferishta's chronicle translated by John Briggs, ibid.

Soon thereafter he is reported to have moved to Fatehpur Sikri and his campa.gns began from and ended at Fatehpur Sikri from about 1562 to 1585. This is the precise period in which Akbar is said to have built Fatehpur Sikri.

Akbar's entourage consisted of five thousand harem women, a menagerie of 1,000 wild animals and thousands of nobles, generals and lesser officials. All these could not move to Fatehpur Sikri at a moment's notice and live in a capital of which even the foundation had not been dug.

Mr. Shelat notes [18]"Akbar's earliest Hindu consort, the daughter of Bharmal of Ambar, who was in the family way was sent to Sikri for delivery. She gave birth to a son, August. 30, 1569. In November 1569 a daughter, Khanum Sultan was born and in July 1570 Salima Begum gave birth to prince Murad. Daniel a third son was born at Ajmer on September 10, 1572. . . . [19]On September 23, 1570 Akbar again visited Ajmer halting at Sikri for 12 days on the way." The above passage makes it clear that Akbar had visited Sikri before 1570 and that all his principal wives had been staying in Fatehpur Sikri at least from the beginning of 1569 A.D. According to traditional accounts Fatehpur Sikri was not even conceived by Akbar before 1569. Then could he and his wives visit there unless Fatehpur Sikri already possessed palatial buildings where emperor Akbar and his wives could stay in royal comfort.

18. P. 102, Cambridge History of India, Vol. IV.
19. P. 116, Akbar, by J.M. Shelat.

The popular belief that Akbar sent his wives to Salim Chisti's hermitage in Fatehpur Sikri is based on a canard palmed off by flatterers who wanted to credit Akbar with the building of Fatehpur Sikri. The above canard can be exposed with a little cross examination. Firstly Akbar's wives who observed strict purdah would not be sent to a male (Fakir Salim Chisti) for delivery. Secondly any recluse worth his name and salt himself would not undertake the deliveries of others' wives. A recluse shuns the world precisely to get rid of such worries. Thirdly Sheikh Salim Chisti is not known to have been running a maternity home. He is also not known to have been a specialist in gynaecology and obstetrics. Fourthly had he been living in some miserable shanty Akbar's wives couldn't have been sent there for delivery. Fifthly according to Monserrate and Badayuni, quoted by us earlier, Salim Chisti was of an immoral character. Akbar himself being very shrewd, wily and immoral he wouldn't venture to send his wives for delivery to a person whose moral character was suspect.

Mr. Shelat mentions that after Akbar's marriages (sic) with a relation of Rai Kalyanmal of Bikaner and with the daughter of Rawal Har Rai Singh [20]"Akbar again went to Sikri." Akbar wouldn't make frequent trips to Fatehpur especially on honeymoons with every new wife if there would have been no idyllic and dreamland palaces there.

20. P. 117, Akbar, by J. M. Shebat, ibid.

[21]"On July 4,1572 Akbar started from Fatehpur Sikri (first to Ajmer and then to invade Gujerat)." That shows that Akbar had moved his capital to Fatehpur Sikri even before 1572 A.D., and that thereafter until 1585 Akbar transacted all royal business from Fatehpur Sikri. His armies started from and returned to Fatehpur Sikri between 1572 and 1585 or even earlier. According to traditional accounts Fatehpur Sikri was built by Akbar between 1570 and 1585. If the capital was being built how is it that Akbar was residing there precisely during the period of construction. Another absurdity is that Akbar is said to have left Fatehpur Sikri for good in 1585. Thereafter he went there only once. That was in 1601 only on a flying visit. Akbar with his robust commonsense, a shrewd nature, luxurious habits and dissolute ways wouldn't stay in an open field called Fatehpur Sikri, all dug up for building a new capital. And he wouldn't be so idiotic as to leave a brand new capital for ever in the very year in which it is said to have been completed.

[22]"On June 3, 1573 Akbar entered the gates of Fatehpur after an eventful and triumphant expedition. Sheikh Salim Chisti and others came and welcomed him."

If the gates of Fatehpur Sikri existed before June 3, 1573 there must be equally grand mansions to which those gates led. Gates won't stand in a void. Thus if both the gates and palaces existed before June 1573 the canard that Akbar built Fatehpur Sikri between 1570 and 1585 gets effectively scotched.

21. P. 129, ibid.
22. P. 129, Akbar by J. M. Shelat, ibid.

[23]"August 23, 1573 saw him (Akbar) ready and marching out of Fatehpur with a force of 3000 men".

Akbar couldn't have entered Fatehpur Sikri in June 1573 and left it two months later accompanied by huge armies unless Fatehpur Sikri had built accommodation enough to house thousands of soldiers, hundreds of generals, a big royal entourage, a bodyguard, a harem of 5,000 women and a menagerie of 1,000 animals, and horses, elephants and camels belonging to the cavalry.

[24]"The heads of Muhammad Husain and Ikhtiyar were sent to be hung and displayed on the gates of Agra and Fatehpur. Following the custom of Timuroids, Akbar had a pyramid made of the heads of the rebels who had perished that day in the campaign against the rebels in Gujerat".

The mention of the gates of Agra and Fatehpur Sikri, as early as 1573, clearly proves that the gates of Fatehpur Sikri were as ancient as those of Agra. Had they been newly built or under construction the Fatehpur Sikri gates wouldn't be bracketed with Agra gates.

[25]"Badayuni carried the news of the Haldighat victory against Rana Pratap to Fatehpur Sikri reaching there on June 25, 1576." Here there is

23. Pp. 138-40, ibid.
24. P. 370, Vol V., E & D, Nizamuddin's Tabakat-i-Akbari quoted by Shelat.
25. P. 160, Akbar, ibid.

no mention of the construction going on. Had the city been under construction huge detachments of infantry and cavalry couldn't move in and out of Fatehpur Sikri.

Dr. Shrivastava relying on unverified Muslim canards asserts that [26]"the foundation of Fatehpur Sikri was laid in November 1571".

Dr. Shrivastava adds "A brief account of the construction work is given by Father Anthony Monserrate, who was an eye witness of the operations. The stones were brought ready-made, chiselled to shape according to design and fixed up in their proper places and the city rose as if my magic within a short space of time (Commentarius, pages 200-201)."

This is a typically gullible piece betraying a wrong understanding of what Monserrate has said. He has never said that he was an eye-witness of the construction.

Let us refer to Monserrate's writing, ourselves instead of depending on the second hand misinterpretation of Dr. Shrivastava.

Since Akbar wanted to hoodwink the Portuguese by professing superficial admiration for them and their religion he kept pressing the Portuguese rulers in Goa to send their representatives to his court in Fatehpur Sikri.

Accordingly [27]"The first Jesuit Mission left

26. P. 130, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.
27. Editor's introduction, the Commentary of Father Monserrate, S. J. Translated by J. S. Hoyland, ibid.

Goa on November 17, 1579. On December 13 of the same year they left Daman for Surat, and on February 28, 1580, Fathers Aquaviva and Enriques arrived at Fatehpur Sikri. Father Monserrate having been taken ill at Narwar, reached the Mogul capital a week later on March 4. They were warmly received at court. Abul Fazal and Hakim Ali Gilani were asked to look to the comforts and health of the guests." Here there is no mention that the Jesuits arrived in a Fatehpur Sikri which was under construction. Had it been under construction they would have had to live in tents, amidst heaps of stone, dug up earth and lime lying all around, and in the dust and din of thousands of labourers working all over. No emperor himself lives or ever invites ambassadors in such surroundings. The fact that they were made comfortable also shows that the mansions and palaces existed in Fatehpur Sikri much before their arrival.

This Father Monserrate meticulously wrote his diary every night before retiring. It is that diary which has been published as his "Commentarius (commentary)".

Monserrate [28]"Buildings erected by Zeladinus (Jalaluddin Akbar)in various parts of his dominions ...have been built with extraordinary speed. For instance he built a very large peristyle, surrounded with colonnades, 200 ft. square in three months, and some circular baths 300 ft. in circuit, with dressing rooms, private apartments and many water

28. Pp. 200—201, The Commentarius, ibid.

channels in six months. Here he himself bathes. In order to prevent himself being deafened by the noise of the tools with which stones are shaped and beams and other timber cut, he had everything fashioned elsewhere, in accordance with the exact plan of the building and then brought to the spot, and there fitted and fastened together. The priests gave close attention to all this, and were reminded of what is said to have happened at the building of the temple in Jerusalem, when no iron instrument of the builders were heard. They saw that this could have been true without the intervention of a miracle."

This is all that is mentioned in the Commentarius about the founding (sic) of Fatehpur Sikri. Closely scrutinised the above passage is very revealing though superficially misleading.

It must first be noted that Monserrate who kept a daily diary does not testify to any building activity. He mentions buildings in Akbar's dominion which he believed to have been all built by Akbar from the bluffs conveyed to him by Muslim courtiers and flatterers.

We may visualize a gullible Monserrate arriving in Fatehpur Sikri early in 1580 A.D. Agreeably surprised at the pleasing red stone palaces, their ornate interiors and towering gateways. He asks the courtiers who built all those ? According to the cringing Urdu and Persian tradition of Muslim courts everything including one's own continuing existence is credited to the sovereign. If the emperor visiting a courtier's house was introduced to children he would ask whose children were they?

The host in the unabashed and unflinching Muslim tradition would reply "Huzur, they are your children." He would never acknowledge them to be his children, in the presence of his patron courtier or king. A flatterer who can stoop to deny the parentage of his own children would naturally ascribe usurped Hindu buildings to the emperor's creation.

Since a 14-year old Akbar had ascended the throne in 1556 A.D. Monserrate arriving twenty four years later was dismayed to find that the Fatehpur Sikri which was represented to him as being of recent creation, showed not even the slightest trace of any debris, scaffolding or workmen. The absence of all these was explained away by another bluff namely that since Akbar didn't want the dust and din of the construction work, the stones were cut and dressed to specific requirements in far away quarries and just piled one over the other blindly and silently.

Still surprised that even after that absurdity is swallowed there still remained the question of pulleys and scaffolding and hammers and chisels to haul up, hoist and join stone slabs at various heights Monserrate ultimately ascribes it all to magic of the kind which his religious gullibility associated with the creation of the chief temple in Jerusalem.

This clearly shows that Monserrate was brainwashed by Muslim flatterers at Akbar's court.

But there are many more absurdities which crop up from Akbar's fancied authorship of Fatehpur Sikri.

Questions such as who selected and surveyed the site ? how long did it take ? who desgined the layout of the township ? who planned the buildings how many years did the palace complex take to build ? and who constructed the thousands of houses for noblemen, and when ? did Akbar have the time, peace and the funds while engaged in bitter warfare against his own guardian Behram Khan and innumerable Rajput chiefs, rebel courtiers, Muslim rulers and imposters ? and after all this how is Fatehpur Sikri an entirely Hindu structure ? remain unanswered.

There is such overwhelming evidence to expose the historical fraud which ascribes the creation of Fatehpur Sikri to Akbar that it will need a whole independent book to tear that myth to shreds.

Here we shall content ourselves merely by summarizing the prominent points to call off the bluff of Akbar's authorship of Fatehpure Sikri.

(1) No design-drawings and blueprints or names of designers and workmen are on record for laying out the township and erecting its magnificent buildings.

(2) If Fatehpur Sikri was constructed by Akbar why does that name recur in histories af pre-Akbar times ?

(3) Badayuni, a courtier of Akbar clearly says that before the decisive battle with Akbar's grandfather Babur, Rana Sanga had reached Fatehpur.

(4) The references to the hillock and tower of heads of slaugtered Hindus being raised on the

hillock clearly indicates that the Hindus died fighting in the palace complex in a desperate last ditch stand.

(5) The hundreds of graves in the quadrangle inside the Buland Gateway are of the Muslims who were killed in that last engagement inside the palace complex two generations before Akbar.

(6) Fatehpur Sikri has a gate flanked by huge stone elephants with their trunks arching over the gate. This design is exclusively Hindu. It is seen in pictures of Goddess Lakshmi. Moreover elephant statues at gateways and inside palaces are a common Hindu motif. Such elephant statues adorn the Gwalior Gate of Gwalior fort, the interior of the Maharaja's palace in Udaipur and the gateway of the City Palace in Kotah. Elephant statues are found flanking the royal gate of the Red Fort in Delhi. Similarly it is on record that elephant statutes flanked the royal gate of the Red Fort in Agra. They were removed by iconoclastic Muslim invaders and occupiers. We have already proved in our book titled 'Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research' that the Red Forts in Delhi and Agra are of pre-Muslim Hindu origin.

(7) There is a fat, Hindu stone lamp post bristling with stone brackets to hold lamps, outside the Elephant Gate. Such lamp posts may still be seen all over India infront of goddess temples. That lamp post in Fatehpur Sikri is fraudulenty explained away as Akbar's memorial to a favourite deer or elephant. One wonders whether the dear deer or elephant had whispered a dying wish

in Akbar's ears that it wished to be commemiorated by a Hindu lamp post. And considering that Akbar kept a menagerie of 1000 wild animals we should have had similar memorial columns for every hyena, bear, wolf, cheetah, tiger, lion, dog, ass, elephant, camel and pig around all towns and buildings ascribed to Akbar. It must also be remembered that Muslims are image-breakers and not image-makers and Akbar was as fanatic a Muslim as any other.

(8) Hindu mythological scenes: Swastik, peacocks and palm trees have been etched on the inner walls of the red stone palace apartments in Fatehpur Sikri. All Hindu motifs have been disfigured with Muslim chiselling and tinkering.

(9) There are tanks in Fatehpur Sikri still known by their Hindu, Sanskrit names such as Anup Talao (peerless tank) and Karpur Talao (camphor tank). Camphor is a sacred requirement for Hindu idol-worship.

Had Akbar constructed Fatehpur Sikri he wouldn't have permitted the huge Buland Gate quadrangle to be turned into a Muslim graveyard. It happened to be a graveyard because Muslims died fighting there during Babar's assault against Rana Sanga two generations before Akbar.

(11) If Fathepur Sikri had been a-building from 1570 to 1585 how did Akbar live there precisely during that period ?

(12) If Fatehpur Sikri was completed in 1585 why did Akbar leave it precisely in that year? was he an idiot to live in a township under construction and leave it on the date of its completion?

(13) Akbar's final exit from Fatehpur Sikri was necessitated because the large reservoir which formed the main source of water to the township burst in october 1583 and went dry. That is the reservoir mentioned in Babar's Memoirs two generations before Akbar. Had it been a new creation at Akbar's orders it would not have burst. And if a reservoir had burst Akbar would have massacred all those involved in that shoddy construction. In fact the lake burst precisely because the usurping Muslims did not possess the know-how to maintain the captured Hindu reservoir. Having been damaged during Babar's assault and in subsequent skirmishes the lake burst from want of maintenance. The fact that it continued to sustain the Muslim usurpers from 1526 to 1583 despite war damage and lack of maintenance is a compliment to its Hindu engineering competence.

(14) Concocted descriptions of Akbar having built a mosque and a house of worship and other buildings are all anomalous and contradictory.

(15) Visitors like Francis Xavier have mentioned that even in Akbar's lifetime Fatehpur Sikri was in ruins. This is very important evidence since it proves that Akbar lived in a Fatehpur Sikri which his grandfather Babar had taken by storm.

(16) There is a painting which has been reproduced alongside page 82 of Mr. J.M. Shelat's book 'Akbar' (latest edition published by the Bharatiya

Vidya Bhawan, Bombay-7) the caption of which says that it depicts Humayun seated with his courtiers in Fathpur. Since Humayun was Akbar's father that painting belonging to a period before Akbar's birth emphatically and visually proves the existence of Fatehpur Sikri before Akbar.

(17) The building of Fatehpur Sikri is said to have begun somewhere between 1564 and 1571 A.D. according to different versions. This Vagueness would not have been there if Fatehpur Sikri had been really built by Akbar. We have at least three contemporary chroniclers namely Badayuni, Abul Fazal and Nizamuddin who were Akbar's courtiers. They would not differ in their accounts unless they were all bluffiing. For instance Vincent Smith observes[29] "The language of Abul Fazal in the passage quoted might be understood to mean that Akbar did not begin his extensive programme of building at Fatehpur Sikri until 1571, but this is not a fact, his buildings had actually been begun in 1569."

From the above observation it is apparent that Abul Fazal has used vague and devious language regarding Fatehpur Sikri and that subsequent historians like Smith are hard put to divine the real import or meaning of Abul Fazal. They, therefore, indulge in vague conjectures which are all wide off the mark.

(18) Sheikh Salim Chisti's brother was known as Ibrahim Fatehpuri. He would not get that appellation unless his family had settled down in Fathepur Sikri for generations.

29. P. 75, Akb r the Great Mogul, ibid.

(19) Smith says[30] "In August 1571 Akbar came and stayed in Fatehpur Sikri in the Sheikh's quarters." This has a deeper meaning. Since Babur had stormed Fatehpur Sikri and gone, many Muslim fakirs headed by Sheikh Salim Chisti had occupied the redsone palaces. Humayun had at no time maintained any permanent establishment in Fatehpur Sikri. Two generations after Babur when Akbar decided to move from Agra to Fatehpur Sikri for security reasons his move at a moment's notice was made possible only because there were grand, majestic palaces and massive defence walls already existing in Fatehpur Sikri. Since Sheikh Salim Chisti had already settled there and had been guarding the premises against Hindu re-occuption Akbar is said to have come and occupied Chisti's building. But it may be recalled that even earlier Akbar's queens had their deliveries in Fatehpur Sikri's palaces.

(20) In a redstone-paved quadrangle amidst the Fatehpur Sikri palace complex, infront of the Panchmahal is an ornate Astrologer's Seat. The decorative stone festoon which adorns the seat's top has figures from Hindu mythology carved in it. An astrologer was a prominent official in all Hindu royal households.

(21) In front of the Astrologer's Seat at the far end of the courtyard is a stone cistern known as the 'ghati-patra' or the water clock device by which Hindus used to reckon their split-second timings so necessary in finding out the auspicious moment to begin Hindu worship or festivities.

30. Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

(22) Fatehpur Sikri has a drum-house which is an essential part of all Hindu palaces and temples. Muslims frown on music.

(23) Fatehpur Sikri has Ashva-Shala, Gaja-Shala, Ooshtra-Shala (i.e. stables for horses, elephants and camels). No Muslim palace had these. Hindu palaces do have it.

(24) The board of Chaupat, a Hindu game has been inscribed in the centre of the redstone courtyard in front of the Panch Mahal. Chaupat was a very popular Hindu game in mediaeval times. Muslims never played or play that game.

(25) Incidentally the Chaupat design also represents the layout of Fatehpur Sikri. Hindu architects used to carve out the basic scale they used in constructing buildings, in some part of the building. In the Taj Mahal courtyard, it is the full length trident pinnacle on the dome which has been inscribed on the floor below as the basic scale used in the construction of the Taj Mahal. In the case of Fatehpur Sikri the design used to plan the township is that of the Chaupat game board.

A very important piece of evidence of the Hindu origin of Fatehpur Sikri, that it was a Hindu capital before Rana Sanga lost it to Babur, is found in the figures of Lord Rama, the Hindu incarnation, and of Hanuman, the Hindu herculian warrior of the Hindu epic Ramayana, found in it.

An Archaeological Survey of India publication

states [31]"Maryam ki-Kothi (Maryam's House), also called Sunehra-Makan, or 'Golden House,' consists of a long room with three small rooms at its right angles on the ground floor, and a verandah on three sides. One of the pillars in the verandah is covered with the figures of Rama and Hanuman —Hindu gods, and the walls are covered with paintings."

The myth of the building of Fatehpur Sikri by Akbar can thus be blown to pieces from every angle. An exhaustive discussion will require a separate book on Fatehpur Sikri alone. We therefore leave it at that and proceed to examine the other equally fantastic claims of Akbar's authorship of various townships and buildings.

The Red Fort in Agra

Keene's Handbook for Visitors to Agra and Its Neighbourhood, gives a 2,000-year history of the Red Fort in Agra, and then quotes a rumour of Akbar's times that Akbar demolished the fort in 1565 for no rime or reason and constructed another. In 1566 Adham Khan who murdered Atgah Khan, was punished by being thrown down from the second storey of the royal apartments inside the fort. Keene expresses a very pertinent doubt in a footnote, that if the fort was demolished in 1565 how come that Akbar had begun to stay there in 1566 and a man was flung down from the second storey. Keene adds that even the foundation

---

31. P. 310 Part II, Archaeological Remains, Monuments and Museums, published in 1964 by the Director General of Archaeological Survey in India, New Delhi.

of the extensive fort could not have been completed within three years. Under these circumstances Akbar's evacuating the Red Fort, its demolition, removal of the heaps of debris, digging up of the old foundation and digging the new foundation after a new plan, filling it up, ordering the required redstone, marble, bricks, and lime for the superstructure and having the whole edifice decorated with shining plaster and multicolour ornate floral designs, all within the space of 12 months smacks of Arabian Nights magic. Unfortunetly Indian History has been loaded with such fantastic myths without arousing anybody's suspicions.

Ajmer

Ajmer had been an ancient seat of Hindu Kings centuries before Akbar. It is a corrupt form of the Sanskrit term Ajaya-Meru (meaning the invincible Mount Meru). It derives its name from the fort Taragarh built on a mountain top. At its foot lies Ajmer city. In the city is an ancient palace now occupied by Government offices. It is this palace, the fort and the other remains surrounding fakir Moinuddin Chisti's tomb that are credited to Akbar. But Akbar used to frequent Ajmer from the age of 19 to direct his aggressive operations against Rajput rulers. He could not have gone and stayed there had there been no ready palace. Even before the advent of Muslims Ajmer had a long succession of powerful H:ndu monarchs. The palaces, tombs, fort, gateways and the other ruins are ancient Hindu constructions stormed and devastated in successive Muslim assaults. Akbar

stayed in the palace in Ajmer city in which earlier Hindu Kings like Vigrahraj Vishaldeo and Prithviraj had lived earlier. That is why fraudulent Muslim accounts claim that Akbar founded towns and cities and built forts, palaces and magic speed. All this magic is of the flattering mansions at courtiers' cringing pen which ascribed all earlier Hindu buildings to Akbar. Similar 'quick building magic' has been claimed for Allauddin Khilji too.

Moinuddin Chisti Tomb

In Ajmer at the foot of Taragad, the mountain fortress, is a shrine, where Muslims gather every year to commemorate Sheikh Moinuddin Chisti. Whether he was actually buried there needs to be investigated because there have been instances of fake tombs. The precincts of the shrine are clearly a part of the fort's outer defences. A huge stone archway leads to the shrine. This was a part of the Hindu citadal stormed by Muslim invaders. After capture fakirs like Moinuddin Chisti lived amidst such ruins. When they died they were buried in their dwelling places. This applies equally to all mediaeval Muslim tombs in India. They are all Hindu temples misused as Muslim tombs.

Allahabad Fort

Indian histories taken in by the fraudulent assertions in Muslim chronicles have credited Akbar with the construction of the fort in Allahabad at the confluence of the Ganga and Yamuna.

Vincent Smith observes, for instance "[32]One of the most sacred places of pilgrimage and known to Hindus as Prayag does not appear to have been fortified. In october 1583 Akbar travelled from Agra to the confluence, most of the way by river. He began the building of the fort in November. It was completed in a remarkably short time. A great city, the modern Allahabad, grew up in the neighbourhood of the fortress."

There are many flaws in that statement which betrays remarkable gullibility of authors of Indian historical text books. Firstly, the very vague statement that prior to Akbar "Allahabad does not appear to have been fortified" is very naive. In mediaeval India every town and village used to have massive fortifications.

Allahabad fort is of immemorial antiquity built through and through in the Hindu style. Its inner royal apartments are all carved in the style of Hindu palaces. Inside the fort are Hindu shrines like the Pataleshwar temple and the sacred banyan tree (the Akshayawat).

Towering inside the fortress is an Ashokan stone pillar which shows that the fort is at least of king Ashoka's time if not of earlier origin.

Secondly, Allahabad being a place of Hindu pilgrimage it would'nt be left unfortified. On the opposite side of the fort across the Ganga is an ancient township called Jhusi which dates back to the Ramayana. Similarly Allahabad alias

32. P. 161, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Prayag is not a modern town but perhaps the ancientmost city in India with a history of many milleniums. Its fort could only be constructed at the confluence of the Ganga and Yamuna because the two streams constitute natural moats making at least two sides of the fort invulnerable.

Allahabad not only had an ancient fort but it also had towering river fronts paved with stones, their steps rising tier upon tier and bristling with temples, as we still see in Banaras. Akbar had them all uprooted when he plundered Allahabad. If there had been no Allahabad what did Akbar plunder ? And since Akbar plundered Allahabad it is clear that he did not found any city. A plunderer never builds a city for the very people he plunders. The two are paradoxical.

So, far from building Allahabad city or its fort Akbar invaded them and razed the innumerable magnificent temples and stately river fronts.

Historians have grossly erred in not subjecting claims of authorship of buildings to close scruitiny. Had they tried to investigate who the archtect was, where are the drawings prepared by him, when did the construction start, when did it end, how much was the expense, why has the fort Hindu shrines and a Hindu pillar inside, why are its royal apartments in the Hindu style—the hoax of Akbar's authorship would not have passed muster. Their vague statement that all of Akbar's buildings and townships were raised in miraculously short periods shows that there is nothing on record. It is such bogus claims which abound in the history

of Muslim rule in India which constrained Sir H.M. Elliot to remark that that history "[33]is an impudent and interested fraud."

Nagarchain

Like other building hoaxes Akbar is supposed to have founded a township and named it Nagarchain. If a lay visitor asks to be shown that miracle township which, Akbar founded, pat comes the traditional historian's reply that the township has vanished so thoroughly that there is not the slightest trace of it.

Histories of the Muslim era in India abound is such bluffs. For instance Humayun is supposed to have built his own Delhi. If you ask where it is the answer is that during his short five-year tenure as sultan Sher Shah wiped out the new Delhi founded by his ousted rival Humayun. He did such a thorough job of the demolition that there is no trace left of Humayun's Delhi. In the same breath we are also told that Sher Shah during his nominal five-year reign not only wiped out every trace of Humayun's Delhi but also built another Delhi of his own. This is something breath-taking especially when Sher Shah's entire reign of five years was a bitter struggle for survival against powerful adversaries.

About Nagarchain Smith says "[34]Executed rapidly at the close of 1564, on return from Mandu,

33. Introduction to Elliot & Dowson's eight-volume study of Muslim chronicles.
34. Pp. 54-55, Akbar the Great Mogul. ibid.

was Akbar's palace or hunting lodge at Kakrali seven miles south of Agra to which he gave the name of Nagarchain or Ameenabad. Agreeable gardens were laid out. A town grew up around the palace buildings. Akbar sometimes received ambassadors there. The strange thing is that when Badayuni was writing late in the reign, all trace of the palace, gardens and town had vanished. No body knows when, why or how the demolition was effected..."

Here again we come across the oft repeated phrase that the building of a whole township was executed so rapidly, almost overnight, that no one knows when it was begun or when it was completed, how much money was spent or who designed the township. Similarly nobody knows how and why it vanished. We also learn that even Akbar's own contemporaries like Badayuni confess their ignorance about the township. It should, therefore, be clear that Nagarchain (which is a Hindu, Sanskrit name) was not built by Akbar but was destroyed by him. Allahabad was not founded by Akbar. Fatehpur Sikri was not built by Akbar but its Hindu ornamentation was disfigured by him. This then leads us to a very important deduction namely that Akbar and other Muslim rulers far from building anything in India wiped out damaged, misused, mutilated or destroyed magnificent Hindu palaces, temples, mansions, fortifications canals, bridges and roads for which ancient India was famous.

Badayuni, perhaps unwillingly, thoroughly

exposes the hoax about Akbar's claim to the founding of Nagarchain. Badayuni states[35] "in this year (972 A.H.) the building of the city of Nagarchain took place. On this subject one of the nobles, at the time of the composition of the Akbarnama ordered me to compose some lines, which I here insert without alteration. It is one of the traditional wonders of the world, that of that city and edifice not a trace now is left, so that its site is become a level plain."

This is a very important statement of far-reaching significance for a correct understanding of Muslim history in India. His is a very honest and frank statement which seems to have escaped from his pen in an angry mood when he must have been hurt by some orders from the court.

Badayuni inadvertently leads us into the secret of how Akbarnama (i.e. the official history of Akbar's reign) happens to be a blatant concoction and fabrication manufactured and modulated according to the dictates coming from the court from time to time. This should open the eyes of all students and scholars to the fact that all Muslim chronicles have been made to order to rehabilitate the vanity, and comfort the conscience of alien monarchs spending their lifetimes in wholesale destruction, aggressive campaigns, ruthless plunder and drink-drenched and drug-sodden amour.

As for Nagarchain itself Badayuni canfesses that he did not find any trace of the township

35. P. 668–70, Vol II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

which he was ordered to record as having been founded by Akbar. It, therefore, follows that Smith has been rash in believing that Akbar founded Nagarchain.

Here we recall a footnote by Sir H.M. Elliot in his critical study of the Jehangirnama, that Muslim chroniclers had the habit of stuffing fabricated claims with minute details to create an illusion of reality.

Manoharpur

Dr. Shrivastava writes: [36]"While at Amber (old Jaipur) Akbar decided to restore an ancient but deserted city and on November 9,1577 he laid its foundation with his own hands. He ordered his architects and engineers to build a fortress and other buildings and named the new city Manoharpur after the name of Manohardas, son of Rai Lon Karan. Manoharnagar is 28 miles north-east of Jaipur, and is known as Manoharpur."

The above passage is typical of the pathetic gullibility of writers of our history text books and heads of university history departments. The ease with which they accept fraudulent claims in Muslim chronicles without verification, is astounding for its pathetic naivee.

Even a cursory examination of the origin of Manoharpur stated above would reveal that the whole story is a chauvinistic concoction from beginning to end.

36. P. 229, Akbar the Great, ibid.

The first question we ask is that during Akbar's time when there existed thousands of decadent or extinct townships deserted by people fleeing from Muslim atrocities what made Akbar choose one near Jaipur alone for restoration. The second question is what architects and engineers did he possess? It is our contention that he possessed none. He had with him only an army of stone cutters who at Akbar's or his courtiers' bidding inscribed Muslim claims on earlier Hindu buildings. The third question is who paid for the huge expenditure which must have been incurred on the revival of the township? If Akbar spent it what interest did he have and what return did he get for his investment? How long did it take to resurrect the city? To whom were the palaces, fort and dwellings handed over for occupation? Were they given gratis or on a hire-purchase basis? If the earlier township had been deserted which people were asked to populate the new buildings? If people residing elsewhere were persuaded to occupy the new city what incentive were they offered? Is there any corresponding exodus on record to justify the claim that people from some neighbouring township came and occupied the new town founded by Akbar? If Akbar named the new town as Manoharpur why is it called Manoharnagar? If Akbar gave it a new name what was the name of the old defunct town? If Akbar gava it a new name how is it he chose a Sanskrit name and not some Persian or Arabic name since he had even converted an elephant's Hindu name into a Muslim name? Why did Akbar name the township after the son of some Hindu

ruler of all people? What business or interest, provocation or pretext did Akbar have in reviving a Hindu township in the vicinity of somebody else's capital? Were there not enough decadent or defunct towns all around Delhi, Agra and Fatehpur Sikri which were the haunts of Akbar? The obvious conclusion, therefore, is that Manoharnagar alias Manoharpur is an ancient city. The claim that Akbar founded it is a hoax. He may have passed through it on one of his many invasions of Rajasthan, giving his sycophant chroniclers an occasion to concoct the story that Akber founded it.

Apartments for 5,000 Royal Prostitutes

Abul Fazal records to the glory of his overlord[37] "His Majesty has made a large enclosure with fine buildings inside, where he reposes. Though there are more than 5,000 women he has given to each a separate apartment. He has also divided them into sections." We wonder where on earth that huge building complex consisting of 5,000 suites, is. Had there been any such our government or any factory would have been very happy to use it for staff quarters in these days of housing shortage. We have unsuccessfully scoured the whole of dead Akbar's erstwhile domain to find anything even remotely similar to a 5,000 suite complex. This should alert students of history to the blatant lies that Abul Fazal has recorded to glorify his master. All that we may concede is a mere pig-sty-type enclosure where over 5,000 hap-

37. Ain 15, Ain-i Akbari Vol. III, Blochmann's translation.

ot
find
ing

less abducted women were herded up to be at the beck and call of the emperor's amours.

If Muslim claims are subjected to such close cross-examination their fraud can be exposed in no time. Masters of historical methodology have repeatedly emphasized that statements in chronicles, especially mediaeval Muslim chronicles, must not be taken at their face value; that they should be subjected to a detective-like scrutiny, and that every case should be argued threadbare as a lawyer would do. These very wise principles have been given a clean go-by in the compilation of text books of Indian history. The result has been disastrous. It has burdened Indian history with blatant falsehoods which through repetition and sheer passage of time have acquired the sanctity of truth.

"This examination of a cross-section of the building claims made on Akbar's behalf should alert students of Indian history to be very cautious when studying Muslim chronicles. Very often truth is turned so topsy turvy that the very opposite of what is claimed will be found to be correct. We have already illustrated this by explaining that whenever a Muslim ruler or courtier is credited with having raised a building or founded a township that should be understood to mean that he ravaged, plundered or destroyed it as Akbar did with the Hindu township of Nagarchain.

Where Muslim chronicls say that temples were destroyed and mosques were built what they really mean is that Hindu temples were seized and put to use as mosques (and tombs).

Where Muslim chronicles claim that an Akbar or a Ferozshah built a palace or a fort all that can be conceded, even taking a very liberal view, is that he, at the most, spent a paltry sum to repair a Hindu building damaged when it was stormed. Almost invariably even that paltry sum or many times that sum was extracted from the downtrodden subjects by levying a tax. Such exactions made for the repairs to Fatehpur Sikri and the Red Fort in Agra are on record though they masquerade as sums spent on building a new fort and a new Fatehpur Sikri. Akbar[38] or any other Muslim ruler did not lay even one single brick over another at least in India. All that they did was that they usurped and misused Hindu mansions.

Jestifying to this, Monserrate a Jesuit contemporary of Akbar, who observed mediaeval Muslim life and practices at close quarters remarks[39]..."the Musalmans whose nature is indeed that of barbarians, take no interest in such things (i.e. erecting massive and ornate buildings and townships). Their chronicles being scanty and unreliable and full of old wives' tales...

However I was told its (i. e. Mandu alias Mandavgarh in Malwa, Central India) builders were Mongols of a different tribe from that which has

38. This point has also been expanded in the books titled : "Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research" and "The Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace" written by the author of this book.

39. P. 16, The Commentarius of Father Monserrate, ibid.

been celebrated in our own times. For, it is said that 200 years ago, the Mongols being in search of a fresh oountry to occupy, left their ancestral encampments, invaded India and settled at Mandho." This passage shows how Muslims have been bluffing generations of European visitors to India. In 1579 when only 53 years had elapsed since Babur the first Mogul invader established himself in India, Muslim flatterers at Akbar's court had the cheek to tell Monserrate that two hundred years earlier another Mongol tribe had occupied Central India and built the massive and magnificent Hindu temples and mansions in Mandavgarh. The statements of European scholars which are the result of mediaeval Musiim brainwashing must not, therefore, be accepted without a careful check-up and corroboration from other unimpeachable sources.

Monserrate adds [40] "the religious zeal of the Musalmans has destroyed all the idol temples which used to be very numerous. In place of Hindu temples, countless tombs and little shrines of wicked and worthless Musalmans have been erected in which these men are worshipped with vain superstition as though they were saints (Footnote :—The persons whose names stand out conspicuous in this business of destruction were Allauddin Khilji and also Malik Naib Kafur, Sikandar Lodi and Babur)."

Taking the evidence quoted above, into consi-

40. P. 27, the Commentarius by Father Monserrate, ibid.

deration it is clear that the very Muslim invaders who uprooted Hindu images and misused Hindu mansions, palaces and temples as mosques, tombs and residences have been credited with having built them, through fraudulent claims repeated over centuries of Muslim occupation. It is high time that students, teachers and scholars of history and archaeology took a second look at historical buildings in India with a view to trace their true history instead of relying on mere bluff and bluster as hitherto. The guide rules mentioned above provide the long lost key to a correct understanding of India's mediaeval history which has been badly tampered with, mutilated and fabricated all these years.

CHAPTER XXII

DIN-E-ILAHI

Literally interpreted the term Din-e-Ilahi signifies 'God's own religion' or system. This term has been much abused, misunderstood and misused in accounts of Akbar's reign. In most Indian histories it is lustily boosted as a wonderful religion invented by Akbar by blending the golden characteristics of all religions known to him and it is added for good measure that it was inspired by his compassionate concern for the temporal happiness and spiritual bliss of his subjects. If we go to the root of all such fantastic praise heaped on an imaginary system we find that it is much ado about nothing.

The term Din-e-Ilahi arose out of a constant acrimonious tussle and war of nerves between a fiercely egotistic Akbar and a fiercely fanatic Muslim priesthood consisting of qazis, maulvis and maulanas fed on archaic and antediluvian notions. As an all-powerful despot Akbar wouldn't tolerate any restrictions placed on or any objections raised at his autocratic behaviour. Correspondingly the Muslim priesthood was plagued by Akbar's constant inroads into the privacy of their married life to abduct their wives and sisters to his own harem, by his compelling them to take spirituous liquors, opium and other stupefying drugs, and by his plunder or confiscation of their wealth at will.

Incensed by such licentious and autocratic behaviour they would raise religious objections and place orthodox restraints on Akbar. He retorted by flinging defiance at them, and asserting that he was not amenable to their rules, and that he followed his own religion, which was God's own religion.

Thus, on a closer analysis, what is usually flaunted as Akbar's wonderful religion in effect turns out to be anti-religion or a defiance of all religious curbs on his licentious and autocratic behaviour. This is exactly what a contemporary Jesuit, Monserrate has recorded from personal observation of Akbar's court. A disappointed and disgusted Monserrate justly complained "[1]We may justly suspect that Zeladinus (Jalaluddin Akbar) had been led to summon the Christian priests not by any divine prompting but by curiosity and too ardent an interest in hearing new things, or perhaps by a desire to attempt the destruction of men's souls, in some novel fashion...Rodolfus—(another Jesuit priest) hoped that Zeladinus would be converted from a wicked life to the worship of God. (Rudolfus) was delivered unscathed by God from the midst of barbarious and ferocious Musalmans, from many threatenings of death and destruction...He was murdered in the 33rd year of his age on July 15, 1583."

Monserrate is right in noting that the Din-e-Ilahi was a diabolical system invented for the destruction of human souls, and not for their salvation.

1. Pp. 192-196, the Commentarius, ibid. 2. P. 173, ibid.

There are specific tests to ascertain whether a system is a religion. Every religion has its own shrines, temples, mosques or prayer halls. Din-e-Ilahi had none such. Every religion has a priesthood, which Din-e-Ilahi did not have. Every religion has some prayers which also Din-e-Ilahi did not have. Every religion has some metaphysical explanation about the creation of the universe and a philosophy for attaining salvation of its own concept. Din-e-Ilahi had nothing of these. Historians have therefore, blundered in asserting that Din-e-Ilahi was a religion, without applying any tests.

A footnote to the Commentarius says that devotion to Akbar was the main tenet of Din-e-Ilahi. This is absolutely true. As observed earlier Akbar was a fiercely egotistic egoist whose vanity made him desire that every human being bow down to him as sovereign, plenipotentiary, prophet and divinity all rolled into one.

Akbar's flouting the authority of the Mullas is often paraded as proof that he was not a fanatic Muslim. This is not true. First and foremost Akbar was an egotist who wanted to be regarded as God and prophet. But the hard core of his heart was always that of a fanatic Muslim, wholly Muslim and nothing but Muslim. Monserrate cautions us against misunderstanding Akbar's overt moves or protestations. Monserrate [2]notes "He (Akbar) went on in the same strain (praising the Pope and asking the Portuguese priest to kiss the Pope's feet (when the Jesuit went to Europe on Akbar's embassy) in proxy for him and bring some

written message from the Pope) saying things which might have been uttered by some pious Christian king. He even declared he was no Musalman and attributed no value to the creed of Mohammad, saying that he was a follower of God alone without a rival."

Since Akbar used to flout the Maulvis by announcing that he was no Muslim and therefore not subservient to their religious authority the poor maulvis and fanatic chroniclers like Badayuni made it a convenient peg to hang their curses against Akbar on. As poor subjects absolutely at the mercy of a cruel despot like Akbar, the only weapon they had to strike Akbar with in their fanatic wrath, was to dub and condemn him as a renegade and an apostate. In those days of religious orthodoxy the priesthood could threaten a monarch with religious sanctions. But Akbar's wile more than matched his maulvis's guile resulting in the latter's impotent frothing, fretting and fuming.

In order to cut the maulvis to size and put them in place Akbar used to skip[3] "the customary Islamic prayers at the time appointed by Mohammad, and did not observe the month's fast called Ramadan. He frequently made jokes at the expense of Mohammad, especially at his being thrust out of doors without shoes or breeches on account of his licentiousness. All this enraged many Musalmans and especially one (Khwaja Shah Mansur)."

3. Pp. 64-65, the Commentarius, ibid.

The above description of Akbar reviling at prophet Mohammad, recorded by Monserrate we accept as true. But it has to be properly understood. In running down Mohammad, Akbar wished himself to be regarded as a prophet and God by all his subjects. This does not mean that he had shed any of his illiterate Islamic fanaticism.

Akbar used to keep the maulvis guessing by professing to be impressed by other religions. This was his mode of making the maulvis cower in the fear that Akbar may at any time renounce Islam. If the sovereign took to another religion they knew what their fate would be. They would have been either forcibly converted or tortured, to death. In order that such a threat should be kept hanging perpetually over their heads so that they may not raise any religious objections to Akbar's despotic and licentious behaviour he used to often parade a faked love for other religions. As part of this strategem he used to have priests of other religions surround him. This served a double purpose. It satisfied his vanity and egoism in being the central figure admired by a throng of people belonging to many faiths and regions, and secondly it kept the Muslim maulvis at bay or in leash. As part of his make-believe, Monserrate records, that when the Jesuit priests moved to the palace precincts[4] "Akbar (went to their quarters, and) prostrated himself on the ground in adoration of the Christ and his mother."

4. P. 48, the Commentarius, ibid.

Monserrate has also recorded how during Akbar's time Islam reigned supreme in all its fanatic fury. Monserrate says [5]"Daulapuram (Dholpur) is equidistant from Agra which is the capital of the empire, and from Fatehpuram where the great king resides...The religious zeal of the Musalmans has destroyed all idol temples which used to be very numerous. In place of Hindu temples countless tombs and little shrines of wicked and worthless Musalmans have been erected in which those men are worshipped with vain superstition as though they were saints."

This should convince historians that all mediaeval Muslim tombs and mosques in India are erstwhile Hindu temples and mansions. It should also persuade them not to believe in the sophistry that Muslim invaders aimed at a fusion of Hindu and Muslim styles in the buildings they erected. It is wrong, therefore, to explain away the out and out Hindu architecture of Fatehpur Sikri, as having been born of Akbar's fancy for Hindu architecture. Firstly Akbar has been proved to be as fanatic as any other mediaeval Muslim. Secondly, as Monserrate states, even in Akbar's times all Hindu idols and motifs used to be ruthlessly disfigured. In this context when we are told that in 1580 when the first Jesuit mission arrived and [6]"the fathers perceived from afar the city of Fatehpuram...they began to gaze with the keenest delight upon the great size and magnificent appearance of the city," it proves that

5. P. 26, the Commentarius, ibid.
6. P. 27, ibid.

Fatehpur Sikri was a grand inhabited city even before 1580. When that is so Muslim accounts saying Fatehpur Sikri was completed by 1583-85 are all concoctions. Even after completion how many years would it take for about two hundred thousand people to occupy the city and hold regular bazars as Fatehpur Sikri is stated to have had ?

Monserrate states[7] "what ever pertains to digressions from the direct course of my narrative I have gathered primarily from King Zelaluddin (Akbar) himself." This explains why he attributes Fatehpur Sikri to Akbar. As a vain egoist Akbar wouldn't confess that he lived in a second hand Hindu township conquered by his grandfather Babur. He misrepresented it as having been newly constructed by himself. Apparently dismayed at seeing no sign of recent construction Monserrate exclaims that if it was so constructed it must have been raised overnight as though by divine magic with material fashioned in distant quarries and silently piled and fixed in place.

[8]"The number of adherents of the Divine Faith, Akbar's political sham religion, was never considerable. Blochmann has collected from Abul Fazal and Badayuni the names of 18 prominent members. Raja Birbal being the only Hindu in the list...The organisation cannot well have survived the murder of Abul Fazal (because according to Badayuni he was an arch flatterer who mobilized people to

7. Monserrate's introduction to the Commentarius.

8. Pp. 159-160, Akbar the Great Mogul, by Vincent Smith, ibid.

swear all temporal and spiritual allegiance, subservience and adherence to Akbar), its high priest, so to say, and of course it ceased to exist after the death of Akbar...The whole scheme was the outcome of ridiculous vanity, a monstrous growth of unrestrained autocracy. The Divine Faith was a monument of Akbar's folly, not of his wisdom."

Smith is right in dubbing the Din-e-Ilahi as a sham political religion arising out of Akbar's ridiculous vanity and monstrous autocracy.

[9]"The truth is that Akbar's pretended 'religion' consisted essentially in the assertion of his personal supremacy over things spiritual as well as things temporal. (He assumed primacy of the Muslim faith by means of the infallibility decree)."

[10]Bartoli writes on the authority of his missionary bretheren that Akbar, summoning a general council "sent a distinguished old man to proclaim in all quarters......the law to be professed throughout the Mogul empire......The four degrees of devotion to His Majesty consisted in readiness to sacrifice property, life, honour and religion."

The above four requirements give us a clear picture of what Akbar's much boosted religion was. He wanted everyone to surrender his life, honour, property and religion and place them at Akbar's mercy and disposal. Surrendering religion was renouncing the authority of the maulvis and qazis. Surrendering life and property for Akbar's

9. P. 153, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

10. Pp. 152-154, ibid.

sake was to increase his wealth and extend his domain. The implication of surrendering one's honour was an undertaking not to object to Akbar's demand, if any, for sodomy and lifting women from their families for his own or his courtiers' or guests' harems.

It was but natural, therefore, for a few abject flatterers alone, like Abul Fazal and Birbar, to kowtow to those humiliating conditions of despotic autocracy. This was no religion but a ganging up for personal aggrandizement.

With a view to make the Islamic priesthood powerless Akbar,[11], "at the end of June 1579, displaced the regular preacher at the so-called chief mosque in Fatehpuri Sikri. In order to emphasize (his) position of spiritual leader of the nation, to which he laid claim, (he) availed himself of certain alleged ancient precedents and resolved to recite the khutba himself. The use of the ambiguous phrase Allahu Akbar gave colour to the most extreme criticism...Even Abul Fazal admits that the innovation aroused much uneasy feeling......At times he allowed himself to fancy that in his own person he had bridged the gulf between the finite and the Infinite...His learned and skilful flatterers Abul Fazal, Faizi and the rest were only too willing to lull his mind with such notions, and he after the manner of kings swallowed flattery with pleasure."

The term "Allahu Akbar" means "Allah is Great." But it also connotes that "Akbar himself

11. Pp. 125-129, ibid.

is Allah." Akbar ordered that people must greet each other with that phrase instead of the usual Islamic "Salam Walekum". This was a subtle move to displace both prophet Mohammad and Allah himself at one stroke by indirectly making the public chant that Akbar was Allah himself.

Allauddin Khilji who ruled over Delhi a few generations before Akbar had similarly entertained the secret desire to displace both Mohammad and Allah himself. But Akbar and Allauddin both failed to be hailed as spiritual leaders. They remained what they were, namely cruel, sadist tyrants and despots. They failed to inspire any spiritual allegiance because they had nothing spiritual in them. Their entire make-up was of unrestrained licentiousness.

A typical instance of how Indian histories are based on wishful thinking and unverified hearsay is the following passage :[12] "Akbar showed equal attention to religious men of all creeds and the grant of subsistance allowances for the support of Hindu, Jain and Parsee scholars, saints and religious institutions as well as those of Muslims. This is testified by a number of extant royal firmans or edicts preserved in K.M. Jhaveri's excellant book entitled Royal Firmans......Many similar grants to Hindu scholars, and saints and endowments to Hindu temples in many other parts of the country must have been made following 1576. Unfortunately most of the grant-deeds have perished on

12. Pp. 238-239, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, by Dr. A.L. Shrivastava.

account of human neglect and wear and tear of time."

The assumption that Akbar treated all religions on a par is wrong. Throughout this book we have quoted many contemporaries and many events proving that Akbar was a fanatic Muslim and a cruel tyrant. If his equal regard for all religions is sought to be defended on the ground that he always used to have at his court monks from various creeds like Christianity, Zoroastrianism and Jainism, we have already pointed out that Akbar had those men all around him for two chief fraudulent reasons. His vanity felt ingratiated by having his own person surrounded by men from different faiths and regions, looking up to him for protection and favour. Their presence was also meant ot be a constant threat to the Muslim maulvis that if they ever ventured to assert their religious authority over the emperor he would embrace some other religion and then wreak vengeance on them. The gambit of moving bishops of other faiths like pawns into his ambit was a part of Akbar's nefarious political game.

Moreover, it has been shown by us that Akbar's decrees insofar as they professed to give generous donations or protection to people or shrines of other faiths, were all sham and make believe. They were never intended to be carried out. That is why we find priest after priest coming and over and over again begging for abolition of the discriminatory Jiziya tax, and protection from Muslim atrocities. Akbar had no scruples in appearing to be very sublime, generous, forbearing,

munificent and magnanimous within the confines of his palace. A visitor was reassured with respect to all he sought but the moment he crossed the threshold of the palace he found himself in a world of usury, extortion, murderous assaults and plunderous swoops. In those days of tardy and dangerous travel-modes it was impossible to pay a second visit to the emperor. Even if such a repeat-visit were undertaken there was no guarantee that an audience would be granted, or that the emperor was in good health or was at his capital. Very often Akbar used to be away. If in spite of all these difficulties a second visit did materialise the same game of empty assurances used to be played all over again. There was a tacit understanding between Akbar and his officials that his orders pretending to be fair and generous were not meant to be executed. The visitors themselves, ever though sorely disappointed in finding that Akbar's orders were for mere make-believe, still carefully preserved or paraded those orders and inscribed them on shrines so that they may serve as possible scarecrows and totems to protect themselves and their shrines from molestation and plunder from official marauders who might once in a way be taken in by those fake orders being unaware of their mere show value.

Soon after asserting that Akbar had equal regard for all religions and priests Dr. Shrivastava adds [13]"Akbar every year observed the anniversary of prophet Mohammad's birth." This shows

---

13. P. 244, ibid.

that he remained a fanatic Muslim. Had he not been so he would have equally meticulously observed and celebrated the birthdays of Lords Rama and Krishna, revered by the Hindus who formed a vast majority of Akbar's hapless subjects. On the contrary Akbar is known to have paid at least superficial homage to Christ and Mary but he never prostrated himself before Hindu or Jain idols. The reason is again found in his political expediency. He wanted to humour and hoodwink the Portuguese because he desired from them a continuous supply of their superior armament for his aggressive campaigns and he sought exit and entry facilities, specially for the Meccan pilgrimage at the west coast ports which the Portuguese controlled.

[14]"On Friday, June 26, 1579 (Akbar mounted the pulpit in the grand Jami Mosque of Fatehpur Sikri and recited Khutba (proclamation). According to Badayuni Akbar stammered and trembled while reading it and had to be helped descend the pulpit. He asked the khatib (priest) to read the remaining part.. It was believed by some that the emperor was inspired by some ulterior motive... Within two months of the reading of the Khutba Akbar took the bold step of declaring himself to be the chief interpreter and arbiter of the Shar or Muslim law. This was done through a document called Mahzar, to which he secured the signatures of the prominent ulema of his court...Badayuni correctly observes he was not inclined to brook

14. Pp. 240-244, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.

the idea of subordination to any authority religious or secular. (By that decree among other things) Akbar was authorized to promulgate a new order of law provided that it was in conformity with a verse of the Quran...The decree no doubt conferred on Akbar wide powers and discretion, but it did not make him a mujtahid, in its original sense, much less the supreme head of the Muslim religion ....Abul Fazal admits that the two measures caused great dissatisfaction and unrest."

The above passage is a clear admission that Akbar remained at the core of his heart a fanatic Muslim. All that he craved was supreme pontifical authority over the destinies of men to do just what he pleased unhampered, unquestioned or unobjected to. He continued to think exclusively in terms of the Koran and the Muslim law. Therefore all talk of his trying to synthesize all religions or pay equal respect to all religions is self-contradictory bunkum.

[15]"From amongst the Hindus only Birbar became a disciple. So serious a historian as Haig asserts that by means of bribery and pressure 18 more or less prominent converts were secured (Cambridge History of India, p. 131)...Mansingh said that if discipleship meant willingness to sacrifice one's life he was already one. For initiation a person had to approach the emperor turban in hand, and place it at the emperor's feet. The emperor would then make him rise, place the turban on his head and give him a shast upon

15. Pp. 255-257, Akbar, by J. M. Shelat.

which were engraved the name of Akbar and the motto 'Allahu Akbar'...Din-e-Ilahi was by no means a new religion or a new sect. At the most it was a new order whose purpose perhaps was veneration for its author."

We fully agree with the learned author. The very system of initiation proves that Din-e-Ilahi demanded total subjection to Akbar's person and not adherence to any rules of conduct. Mansingh's remark too is revealing. He saw very clearly that Akbar demanded only personal loyalty sans religion, sans morals and sans scruples which all his stooges, courtiers and others conceded to him in full measure even without his ostensibly asking for it because of the dread of Akbar's vengeance. Akbar further desired them to swear by it, renounce their fear, if any, of Muslim priests outlawing any of his immoral practices, and holding him in such awe and respect as though he were divinity itself.

One who flouts an existing religion is not necessarily the founder of another religion. Take the instance of a son who refuses to conform to his mother's or grandmother's orthodox rules on the specious plea that as a 'modern' he did not believe in antiquated notions of religion, and that he had his own religion. That callous disregard for the religious susceptibilities of the elders by a thoughtless youth amounts to the uprooting of the old, established religion but does not in the least amount to the founding of a new religion. On the same analogy we may say that Akbar's haughty rejection of the authority of fanatic maulvis be-

cause they resented Akbar's invasion of their womenfolk does not prove Akbar's having been the founder of any new religion. His conduct rather proves that he was the uprooter of all rules of human decency.

It must be remembered that Akbar had not converted even himself. Had he founded a new religion he would have declared himself, before everybody else, to be the first adherent of the new religion, and that he was no longer to be regarded a Muslim. He would in that case have changed his own name and that of his wives and children. He would have driven out the Muslim clergy and replaced it by that of his new faith, had it been a reality. With Akbar's pretensions to sainthood and his great military might he could have converted thousands had he really founded any new faith, even as Muslims tortured and threatened millions all over the world to join their faith.

In view of what we have said above we hope that authors, scholars, students, teachers and examiners of history would stop making a fetish of Din-e-Ilahi as a religion, and see it in its true colours—namely that it was a system (as Monserrate says) for the destruction of souls and to ensure complete surrender and submission to Akbar's person of one's life, property, honour and religion. By no stretch of imagination can this be called a religion. Nor can it be glorified on any account. It was a pernicious system which created nothing but hatred all around and led to several revolts.

THE LUSTRELESS GEMS

Like every other aspect of Akbar's reign some historical texts try to boost Akbar as a great patron of arts, literature and able men. As such we are told that his court was adorned among others by nine men who were veritable gems whose lustre shed additional glory on Akbar's benevolent (sic) reign.

The evidence on record proves that they were all worthless panders, stooges, flatterers and opportunists who by their abject subjection to Akbar's autocratic despotism had ceased to have any conscience or scruples.

At the outset we have Akbar's own appraisal of the worthlessness of his ministers. He says [1]"It was the grace of Allah that I found no capable minister, otherwise people would have considered that my measures had been devised by him." Since Abul Fazal, himself one of Akbar's ministers and classified as a 'gem', has recorded Akbar's none-too-complimentary appraisal of his ministers there should be no doubt that they were all lack-lustre gems undeservedly boosted by doting historians.

The nine individuals often classified as special class gems (sic) of Akbar's court are: 1. Abul Fazal

1. P. 2[illegible] Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid. P. 81, Akbar, ibid. 387, Vol. III Abul Fazal's Ain-i-Akbari transl. [illegible] by H. S. Jarret.

2. Abul Faizi 3. Todarmal 4. Mansingh 5. Mirza Aziz Koka 6, Abdul Rahim Khan Khana 7. Birbar 8. Tansen 9. Hakim Humam.

It is already mentioned above that Akbar did not have the slightest regard for any of them. None of them had any memorial raised to him by Akbar, and none of them has ever been quoted or emulated by posterity.

Abul Fazal Allami was the son of Sheikh Mubarak. He was born near Agra on January 14, 15[illegible]1 and was ambushed and murdered at Crown Prince Jehangir's orders on August 9 or 12, 1602 while proceeding from Sarai Burki village to Antri six miles away.

Abul Fazal was an Arab. His ancestor Sheikh Must was a resident of Arabia. In the ninth century his forefathers accompanied some Muslim invaders to Sind. From there Abul Fazal's grandfather Sheikh Khiz, an itinerant fakir moved to Nagor near Ajmer. There Sheikh Mubarak (father of Abul Fazal) was born. Soon after his birth his father and other members of the family perished in a famine. Sheikh Mubarak in his wanderings reached Ahmedabad and stayed there for several years. Later he moved to a village near Agra taking shelter with a fakir, a Sunni but later changed to the Shia sect. Reports of his being a debauchee were conveyed to Akbar. The latter out of hatred for the Shias ordered Sheikh Mubarak's arrest. Sheikh Mubarak convinced that Akbar would have him murdered left his two young sons, Abul Faizi and Abul Fazal at Agra and turned a fugitive and

fled to seek shelter with Salim Chisti. The younger of the two was Abul Fazal. He was introduced to Akbar in 1574 by his elder brother Faizi.

Abul Fazal when first introduced to Akbar, in 1574 A. D. failed to make any impression on Akbar. Abul Fazal cursed his fate since he was sure that once he got an opportunity to be near Akbar he could worm his way into Akbar's heart. Expressing his keen disappointment at being spurned by Akbar Abul Fazal records in the Akbarnama [2]"As fortune did not first assist me I almost became selfish and conceited. The pride of learning had made my brain drunk with the idea of seclusion. The advice of my father with difficulty kept me back from outbreaks of folly. I was sick of the learned of my own land." This shows how Abul Fazal hankered for a life of luxury and royal patronage at court.

"When Abul Fazal was introduced at court at Agra Akbar was busily engaged with his preparations for the conquest of Bihar and Bengal. Abul Fazal attended court immediately on the emperor's return to Fatehpur Sikri where Akbar happened to notice him first in the Jami Mosque."

About Abul Fazal's innate knack for flattery which ingratiated him with emperor Akbar Blochmann notes in the preface to the Ain-i-Akbari "Abul Fazal has far too often been accused by European authors of flattery and even of wilful concealment of facts damaging to the reputation of his master."

2. Preface, Ain-i-Akbari, Vol. III, translated by H. Blochmann.

Towards the end of 1589 Abul Fazal's mother died.

[3]"The courtiers and Prince Salim alias Jehangir were against Abul Fazal. An unexpected visit by Jehangir to Abul Fazal gave him an excellent opportunity to charge Fazal with duplicity. On entering the house he found 40 writers busy in copying commentaries on the Quran. Ordering them to follow him at once, he took them to the emperor, and showing the copies Jehangir said 'what Abul Fazal teaches me is quite different from what he practices in the house.' "

This incident perhaps convinced Akbar that Abul Fazal was the right man to be kept at court where Machiavellism was a dominant requirement.

"Towards the end of 1592 A. D. Akbar promoted Fazal to Du-Hazari (i. e. to a status of a commander of 2,000 footmen). He now belonged to the great amirs (Umra-i Kibar) at court.

His father died at Lahore on Sunday, September 4, 1593 at the age of 90.

Two years later Fazal's elder brother Faizi also died, at the age of 50 (October 5, 1595.)

In the 43rd year of Akbar's reign Fazal was sent on active service for the first time. Prince Murad had not managed matters very well in the Dakhin. and therefore Fazal was sent to return with him whose excessive drinking caused the emperor much anxiety. On the day that Abul Fazal arrived at

3. Preface, ibid.

the camp 20 kos from Daulatabad on the banks of the Purna, Murad died. Fazal continued the campaign. He entered into a treaty with Chand Bibi the amazonian regent of the Nizamshahi kingdom of Ahmednagar."

In the 47th year of Akbar's reign Abul Fazal was recalled with intent to send him against prince Salim alias Jehangir who was then in revolt and had set himself up as emperor in Allahabad. Hearing that Abul Fazal had started from his camp in the south to counter his revolt, Jehangir asked Bir Singh Deo Bundela to ambush Abul Fazal and slay him as he passed through the Bundela's Orchha principality.

Abul Fazal and his party were set upon from all sides while Abul Fazal lay under a tree. Fazal received 12 wounds and was finally transfixed with a spear. His head was severed from the body and forwarded to Jehangir in Allahabad. Jehangir with great glee flung it in a heap of filth. That was perhaps deserved divine punishment for a mouth which had sung undeserved praises of a degenerate Akbar, and burdened history with heaps of shameless falsehoods.

Jehangir held Abul Fazal in great dread. Knowing that he held Akbar's confidence Abul Fazal used to browbeat Jehangir and tick him off even in Akbar's presence in the supercilious manner of an elderly well-wisher. Conscious of Abul Fazal's hypocrisy and cunning Jehangir cultivated a hatred for the former. He says in his Memoirs that while Abul Fazal was with the emperor he

dared not approach his own father Akbar for fear that Abul Fazal would prejudice Akbar against Jehangir by some insinuating remarks. Thus almost barred from approach to his own father Jehangir plotted Abul Fazal's murder.

Abul Fazal had all the vices that a man about a Muslim court could have. He is famous for his gluttony. It is said that exclusive of water he consumed daily 22 seers of food. When he was away from Akbar, as the supreme commander of the Mogul army in the Deccan "his table luxury exceeded all belief. In an immense tent one thousand rich dishes were daily served".

Abul Fazal had a foster brother and two other brothers born of concubines kept by his father Sheikh Mubarak. He had also at least four sisters, so far as is known.

That Akbar considered Abul Fazal of no importance may also be noted from Fazal's end. Akbar did not say even a word of reproach to his son Jehangir for having murdered Abul Fazal because he had any number of flatterers ever ready to curry favour with him and therefore the loss of one didn't matter much to him

Besides all European authors Abul Fazal's own contemporary Badayuni who was Fazal's colleague at Akbar's court and a fellow-chronicler notes that Abul Fazal[4] "was officious, time-serving, openly faithless, continually studying the empror's whims, a flatterer beyond all bounds."

4. P. 202, Vol II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

Thus most European authors, Jehangir and Badayuni are unanimous in certifying that Abul Fazal was a shameless fatterer.

It is therefore that his Ain-i-Akbari chronicle of Akbar's reign must be handled with great caution. There are many things that Abul Fazal has skipped over or grossly misrepresented. Following in the footsteps of his elder brother Faizi who used to compose poems in Akbar's praise Fazal hit upon the idea of singing the emperor's praises in prose. Gradually and unwittingly he found himself writing highly imaginative accounts of happenings at Akbar's court. These he would show to Akbar. The latter gratified in finding a flatterer who could effectively present his cruel and crafty deeds in an agreeable shroud of fabricated glory to hoodwink the people at court and the general public, suffered Abul Fazal to continue his literary fiction. Thus both Akbar and Abul Fazal colluded in fabricating a fraudulent fabric of Akbar's reign, now known as Akbarnama or Ain-i-Akbari.

In undertaking this labour of love Fazal assured for himself a cosy and easy job at court with all luxuries from kitchen delicacies to the proximity of a teeming harem at the royal court, thrown in for good measure. This occupation was also a good excuse for him to shun all field assignments where intrigues, incessant warfare, privations and jealousies made life precarious.

Staying at court writing the empror's panegyrics also ensured for him a strategic position from

where he could make and mar the fortunes of others as well as retain for himself a favoured key position with the emperor so that he could always bask in the sunshine of imperial favours.

These considerations made Abul Fazal more and more of a confirmed flatterer. With every passing day at court Abul Fazal matured into an expert at matching his fulsome flattery to the changing moods, fancies, whims and requirements of Akbar. The resulting Akbarnama is, therefore, not a truthful account of Akbar's reign but a wishful concoction. All those who care for academic truth, and hate falsehood must bear this in mind when handling Abul Fazal's or for that matter any Muslim chronicle.

In order that his cushy and strategic assignment may never end Abul Fazal kept inflating and expanding the chronicle into an interminable account of tents and shamianas, bazar rates, market gossip, court rumours, religious discussions, Akbar's concocted sayings, accounts of Toms, Dicks and Harrys at court and everything else seen, heard or conceived. Like Penelope's Web he never wanted the account to end until he or Akbar died. It is therefore that he never quotes any authorities and his statistics about weights and measures, revenue and bazar rates are all contradictory and vague.

Smith says[5] "I do not think it (i.e. Badayuni's appraisal of Abul Fazal) is far from the truth. Not-

5. Pp. 223-224, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

withstanding Blochmann's opinion to the contrary, the author of the Akbarnama and Ain-i-Akbari was a consummate and shameless flatterer. Almost all matters considered detrimental to Akbar's renown are suppressed, glossed over, or occasionally even falsified His books are one-sided panegyrics...Abul Fazal availed himself of the liberty allowed by his religion in his relations with women. He had at least the canonical four wives. He had a prodigious appetite rivalling that of Sultan Mohammad Bighara of Gujerrat (Footnote: He married Hindu, Persian and Kashmiri wives, in addition to a lady of an 'honourable house.' He says the extra consorts were occasions of great joy to him—Ain, Vol. III. page 449...He had a good conceit of himself as appears from the concluding paragraphs of the autobiography...found in Ain Vol. III, 417-451)."

The reader may well assess the character of an Abul Fazal who was a glutton and a "shameless flatterer" and who wielded unlimited power in an atmosphere seething with intrigue, and who smacks his academic lips in nostalgic delight recalling his lecherous revelries with a wide assortment of women, some of whom at least, according to his own confession, were of ill fame and mean status. Of course when Abul Fazal mentions a lady of an honourable house he means a Muslim woman. Others who, he implies, were not of an honourable house were abducted and kidnapped Hindu women according to the jargon and terminology of Muslim chroniclers.

Vincent Smith's appraisal of Abul Fazal

[6]"Abul Fazal displays unblushing partisanship (in running down Behram Khan vis-a-vis Akbar) ...and even lavishes unstinted eulogies on Pir Mohammad, the worst of Akbar's evil counsellors at this period."

[7]"The same Abul Fazal who records that atrocious deed (of Maham Anaga, the pimp priestess of Akbar's harem slaughtering two beautiful abducted Hindu women detained in Baz Bahadur's harem whom, after defeating Baz Bahudur, Maham Anaga's son Adham Khan sought to appropriate for himself cocking a snook at Akbar. An enraged Akbar journeyed all the way from Agra to Central India to secure the entire harem of Baz Bahadur for himself. His general Adham Khan surprised by the emperor's unexpected visit surrendered all the women except the two choice beauties mentioned above. When Akbar was informed of it he ordered that Adham Khan be brought to book. Maham Anaga, who is made so much of in flattering accounts of Akbar's reign had those two women murdered in cold blood, villainously observing that 'dead women tell no tales' so that her son may be saved from Akbar's[14] wrath by pleading that the women concerned had not been retained by him but had died long back.) was not ashamed to praise the 'wisdom and perspicacity' of the guilty woman." Abul Fazal often refers to Maham Anaga and her colleague Jiji Anaga in glorifying terms such as 'paragons of

6. P. 33, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.
7. P. 38, ibid.

virtue.' They deserved his meed because, knowing as we do Abul Fazal's licentious weakness for women, it was but natural for him to be supplied with a wide assortment and variety of abducted sweet-hearts from Akbar's ever-growing harem pool, by those two women and other so-called wet nurses who managed the women-herd.

[8]"Abul Fazal slurs over the crimes of Pir Mohammad and laments 'so loyal, able and gallant a man underwent such a fate' (namely, was drowned)."

[9]"Abul Fazal relates this horrid barbarity (of Mohammad Mirak being tortured for five successive days by being trussed up in a wooden frame to be tossed and flung by an elephant) without a word of censure."

[10]"At Shahbad, midway between Thaneshwar and Ambala, on a tree adjoining Kot Kachhwaha Shah Mansur (Akbar's Finance Minister) was solemnly hanged (on a charge of treason). Abul Fazal suppresses the information that he was entrusted with the unpleasant duty of execution which is known only from Monserrate." This adds a new dimension and a rare 'lustre' (sic) to Abul Fazal's versatile genius for he has been earlier described as a womanizer, flatterer and glutton, and now he turns out to be even a hangman. He was truly a minister since he ministered to every demand of Akbar. He was thus a perfect factotum ready to play any part at Akbar's bidding from pen-pushing to stabbing and hanging.

8. P. 42, ibid. 9. P. 58, ibid. 10. Pp. 137-142, ibid.

[11]"Notwithstanding the fine phrases about general tolerance which occupy so large a space in the writings of Abul Fazal and the sayings of Akbar, many acts of fierce intolerance were committed."

[12]Abul Fazal met his death in the 52nd year of his age. The theologian who had been the first to suggest to Akbar the idea of assuming the spiritual as well as the temporal guidance of his people, succeeded in 1574, by means of a Koranic commentary in attracting the attention of the emperor. Having once entered on the road to advancement he took good care to secure his continual progress. His favour at court became so marked that the Jesuits speak of him as the "King's Jonathan." Incidentally the fact that a study of the Koran proved to be Abul Fazal's passport to Akbar's heart proves once again that Akbar had never ceased to be a fanatic Muslim.

[13]"Abul Fazal's prose style, as read in Mr. Beveridge's translation of the Akbarnama is intolerable to me. Simple facts are wrapped in a cloud of almost meaningless rhetoric."

Even though Indian authors, on an average, are not so outspoken as European writers where Muslims are to be appraised, and even though Dr. Shrivastava's book titled "Akbar the Great" and its size, encompassing three volumes, indicate that he has a specially soft corner for Akbar and Abul Fazal yet even in his book Abul Fazal has at times come in for adverse notice.

11. P. 159, ibid. 12. P. 223, ibid. 13. P. 302, ibid.

Dr. Shrivastava's reverence for Abul Fazal and his fictitious Akbarnama is apparent from Dr. Shrivastava's preface to his book 'Akbar the Great.' The learned author states "Abul Fazal's Akbarnama must always remain the most valuable primary source (compared to other accounts) of Akbar's life and times as its author had made use of state records and other documents including the aide memoires, which included verbatim everything that Akbar said or did and which was recorded there and then by writers who were employed on this duty. These records and aide memoires have unfortunately perished, but Abul Fazal's work remains as it was, without any diminution or interpolation. (Vincent Smith) was highly distrustful of Abul Fazal whom he unjustly accused of deliberate perversion of facts and even of forgery."

Dr. Shrivastava is wrong in thinking that verbatim records of all that Akbar said or did were maintained in Akbar's time. The very fact that none of those records have come down to us should be an eye-opener. That those records have perished is as specious a plea as the one which maintains that Akbar built a mighty city called Nagarchain which became so defunct within his own lifetime as to leave not even the slightest trace of its location. Similar is the case with the Agra which Sikandar Lodi, and the Delhis which Humayun and Sher Shah are claimed to have founded We hope students, and teachers of Indian history will not hereafter put pathetic faith in such fraudulent assertions.

Since there were no records or aide memoires the question of Abul Fazal making use of them as reference material does not arise. Moreover, as a man engrossed in carnal pleasures and stooping to being an executioner of his colleagues to please his master, and a shielder of murderers like Pir Mohammad and Maham Anaga, Abul Fazal was hardly the man who would take the trouble of basing his statements on court documents with a meticulous regard for truth when his versatile imagination could devise and divine grandiloquent accounts of his master's fictitious glory.

We, therefore, find Vincent Smith's appraisal more accurate. Perhaps even Vincent Smith felt the want of proper words which could express his agony on reading Abul Fazal's academic perfidy that goes by the name of Akbarnama.

Despite Dr. Shrivastava's reverential awe of Abul Fazal's historical genius he is constrained to record [14] Abul Fazal's style is somewhat involved and vitiated by his fulsome flattery of his patron whom he considered a superman."

It should be evident to anyone that an involved and devious style is always the product of a devious mind which strives hard to bypass the bitter truth by circuitous statements or tries to shroud it with the flurry of fulsome encomium. Secondly, it is unjust to Abul Fazal to say that he believed Akbar to be a superman. Abul Fazal was too shrewd a man of the world to take Akbar to be a superman. Abul Fazal had correctly sized up

---

14. Pp. 468-469, ibid.

Akbar as a vengeful despot, and as a shrewd man of the world Abul Fazal took care to remain on the right side of Akbar. That was the only way he could live and live well under Akbar.

Since Akbar had no dearth of flatterers he hardly missed Fazal when the latter was murdered. Testifying to this Dr. Shrivastava remarks "Akbar did not consider him (Abul Fazal) indispensable, did not always accept his advice, and more than once punished him publicly by forbidding him court. A small unpretentious tomb was erected over (Abul Fazal's) body" Even that triangular mound of brick and lime was not commissioned by Akbar but by some local Muslims. Even that was completely ignored as is apparent from the fact that only about 40 years back some archaeology department officials tried to locate Abul Fazal's tomb guided by vague historical descriptions of the ambuscade. They came across a cluster of tombs all around since in the 1,000-year-long Hindu resistance to Muslim onslaughts there are clusters of tombs found all over the country. The archaeology officials by an academic fiat arbitrarily identified one among several clusters of tombs as the one which should include Abul Fazal's tomb The fact that one was half a foot or one foot taller than the others in that cluster of graves clinched the issue with them. That grave has since then been stamped in archaeological records as Abul Fazal's, and official machinery was set into motion to maintain that grave. A small room was then built over the grave.

We thus see how Akbar hardly cared even to mark the site where one of his much vaunted

'gems' was murdered, not to talk of raising a magnificent tomb, for which we are told Muslims had such a proclivity. This instance should further serve as a guide to historians to realize that the so-called palatial tombs are erstwhile Hindu palaces, temples and mansions which came handy for the burial of Muslim conquerors. In out-of-the way places, where no Hindu palaces or temples could be found nearby, as happened in the case of Abul Fazal, their ghosts had to remain content with unpretentious grave mounds. They were not as lucky as the ghosts of Akbar, Jehangir, Mumtaz Begum or Humayun to get lofty Hindu edifices for their burial.

When Jehangir exposed Abul Fazal's hypocrisy to Akbar the latter ostensibly frowned on Abul Fazal. But Dr. Shrivastava feels that[15] "This was probably done to please Salim, for the historian was restored to favour within a few days." This is proof of the collusion between Akbar and Abul Fazal. Dr. Shrivastava's belief that Abul Fazal was a historian, is however misplaced and unjustified.

(2) Abul Faizi the elder brother of Abul Fazal is reckoned as another gem of Akbar's court. He is said to have been a poet though he is seldom quoted or included in any respectable anthology. Faizi was born on September 1547 in Agra. He was introduced to Akbar in 1568 when his father had fled Agra since he was given to understand that Akbar wanted to execute him. Faizi was for sometime employed as a tutor to prince Murad. Later he was appointed Sadar in Agra. In 1588

15. P. 461, Akbar the Great. ibid.

he was honoured with a poet laureate. He and Amir Khusru are reckoned as two noteworthy Persian poets among Muslims in mediaeval India. Faizi is said to have authored 101 books. Such claims must however be properly and meticulously investigated before being believed. Faizi was at times deputed as an envoy. In 1592 he visited the Deccan on one such mission. He suffered from asthama. On a Saturdy (October 4 or 5, 1595) he died at Agra.

Vincent Smith has scant respect for Faizi's poetic muse. He observes[16] "The versifiers, or so-called poets (at Akbar's court) were extremely numerous." Abul Fazal tells us that although Akbar did not care for them, 'thousands are continually at court.' In fact it is these fawning versifiers hanging around for filthy lucre who have been mistaken for scribes and chroniclers by contemporary Jesuits. It is no wonder, therefore, that no historical records to talk of are found of Muslim rule in India. What is found is a pile of panegyric hiding beastly deeds. "So far as I can see, the indo-Persian works of Akbar's age possess little interest as monuments of literary art. It is a relief to turn from the triviality and impurity of most of the versifiers in Persian to the virile, pure work of a great Hindu (Tulsidas—the Hindu versifier of the epic Ramayana) the tallest tree in the magic garden of mediaeval Hindu poesy. His name will not be found in the Ain-i-Akbari or in the pages of any Muslim annalist (yet another proof of the fanatic Islamic exclusiveness of mediaeval Muslim regimes)

16. Pp. 39 92, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid

or in the books of European (nay, even some Indian too) authors based on the narratives of Persian historians. Yet that Hindu was the greatest man of his age in India—greater even than Akbar himself, inasmuch as the conquest of the hearts and minds of millions of men and women effected by the poet was an achievement infinitely more lasting and important than any or all of the victories gained in war by the monarch. He does not appear ever to have been brought to the notice of either the emperor or Abul Fazal. Tulsidas enjoyed no advantages of birth, fortune or education, being the son of ordinary Brahmin parents, who exposed him in his infancy to live or to die, because he had been born in an unlucky hour. Fate or providence willed that the child should be picked up by a wandering mendicant, who gave him sustenance as well as instruction in the legendary love of Rama...)Abul Fazal gives many extracts from the writings of the select 59, which I have read in their English dress, without finding a single sentiment worth quoting, although the extracts include passages from the works of his brother, Faizi, the 'king of poets,' which Abul Fazal considered to enshrine 'gems of thought.' Most of the authors prostitute the word 'love' to the service of the unholy passion and Faizi sins in that way like others. Many of the persons who claimed the honourable name of poet, had no better claim to that title than the composer of acrostics for a magazine has. They exercised their perverse ingenuity in torturing words into all sorts of shapes, omitting words with dotted letters,

constructing cunningly devised chronograms, and such like trivialities...Blochmann held that after Amir Khusro of Delhi, Muhammedan India has seen no greater poet than Faizi...Admitting the justice of Blochmann's verdict, I can only say that the other 'poets' of Muhammaden India must be worth very little. They do not seem to have written anything with substance in it sufficient to stand the ordeal of translation. All, nearly all of them---are disgraced by the filthiness to which allusion has been made."

Vincent Smith has thus very effectively and competently pricked the bloated bubble of fantastic claims about the literary merit of not only Faizi but of all Muslim authors. In a 1,000-year-long rule in an atmosphere surcharged with cooperative conjoint chauvinistic flattery mediaeval Muslim chronicles, poetry, treatises and translations of Hindu works, have been boosted as rare gems of Muslim scholarship. Smith effectively scotches these claims in pointing out that the chronicles rarely contain any truth worth the name and the poetry rarely embodies any noble sentiment, imagery or melody. Readers who care for real history and not communal fantasy must therefore carefully examine all claims of mediaeval Muslim imperial pressure propaganda. It could be that the expertise in astronomy and Sanskrit, geometry and geography claimed in the name of authors like Al Biruni and Badayuni are gross exaggerations of an age of rampant illiteracy.

(3) Todarmal was a Rajput Kshatriya. He was first employed on a minor post to keep

Akbar's military accounts. Having proved to be a dependable stooge he rose to power and eminence. Like Mansingh he too was employed to coax and cajole proud Rajput chiefs into surrendering their daughters for Akbar's harem. Many-a-time Mansingh and Todarmal themselves brought such daughters through coercive force to Akbar. In 1567 Todarmal was deputed to subdue the imposter Sikandar Shah running riot in the Ayodhya region. He achieved success in that and the subsequent campaigns entrusted to him. Like Abul Fazal Todarmal too proved a perfect factotum. That was the surest way to Akbar's favour. In 1576 when Akbar conquered Gujerat he deputed Todarmal to see that enough money was extracted from the Gujeratis to settle all claims, pay for all expenses of Akbar's aggression and yet leave a handsome margin for the royal treasury. Todarmal did such a thorough job of it that an impoverished Gujerat was stalked by an unprecedented famine. Akbar's chroniclers were bound to boost Todarmal's financial talent which squeezed the wealth of poor, downtrodden, defenceless subjects to fill Akbar's treasury and sustain a parasitic nobility but that is no reason why modern authors in blind faith should continue lauding in lyrical rapture Todarmal's 'fiscal wizardry' in the same old imperial strain. Vincent Smith, an independent thinker, rightly observes,[17] "The systematic assessment of the empire for which Akbar and Todarmal are given so much credit was primarily intended to increase the imperial revenue.

17. P. 252-254, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

Akbar was a hard-headed man of business, not a sentimental philanthropist, and his whole policy was directed principally to the acquisition of power and riches. All the arrangements about jagirs, branding (of horses) etc. were devised for the one purpose namely, the enhancement of the power, glory, and riches of the crown. We do not know anything substantial about the actual effect of his administrative measures on the welfare and happiness of the common people. Certainly they did not prevent the occurrance of one of the most terrible famines on record which desolated Northern India late in the reign, from 1595 to 1598." About the revenue system devised by Todarmal which is praised sky high in average Indian histories, Badayuni a contemporary chronicler notes that[18] the usurious exactions were squeezed and screwed out of the poor subjects with such ferocity that the wives and children of the raiyats (peasantry) were sold (as slaves) and scattered abroad, and everything was thrown into confusion. But the Kroris (middle men) were brought to account by Raja Todarmal, and many good men died from the severe beatings which were administered, and from the tortures of the rack and pincers. So many died from the proctracted confinement in the prisons of the revenue authorities, that there was no need of the executioner or swordsman and no one cared to find them graves or graveclothes...At the time of famine and distress, parents were allowed to sell their children.

It is no wonder then that (on July 28, 1587 at

18. P. 192, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid.

night),[19] a Khatri from private hatred wounded Todarmal in a murderous assault. The man was at once cut down.

The lengths to which Todarmal used to go to curry favour with the Muslims may be judged from the fact that in Hindusthan where a vast majority of the population was Hindu, and from times immemorial accounts used to be maintained in indigenous languages it was Todarmal who for the first[20] time "ordered that all government accounts should thenceforth be written in Persian. He thus forced his co-religionists to learn the court language of their rulers."

Blochmann quotes Badayuni about Akbar having passed "orders that the common people should no longer learn Arabic, because such people were generally the cause of much mischief." If even Akbar realized that perpetuation of Arabic caused mischief in Hindusthan the same rule should apply to Persian. Justifying the abolition of Arabic Dr. Shrisvastava observes[21] that "obviously Arabic could not be a language of the people of India." But he forgets that Persian too is equally alien to India.

Despite Todarmal's toeing the Muslim line it must be said to his credit that he remained a staunch Hindu to the end of his life. He success-

19. Aini-i-Akbari, Vol. III, Todarmal's account given by Abul Fazal as grandee No. 39.
20. Blochman's comment on Abul Fazal's account of Todarmal, ibid.
21. P. 387, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid.

fully defied open and subtle pressure to convert or coerce him into accepting Islam. Once when about to leave on a campaign for Punjab he found all the idols and paraphernalia of worship missing from his home altar. Obviously it was a subtle Muslim way of impressing upon an orthodox Todarmal that he could do without his usual Hindu worship and prayers. Poor, helpless Todarmal fretted and fumed and starved himself of food and water for three days in a state of mental torment for having missed his devotions. Ultimately he had to reconcile himself to the sacred loss.

Disgusted by such insults, pin-pricks and affronts a harried Todarmal resigned and lived in Banaras and Hardwar but was recalled. He did not however live long thereafter. At the age of 54, on November 10, 1589 he died in Lahore.

(4) Mansingh was the grandson of the Jaipur ruler Bharmal. Like his two immediate ancestors Mansingh forgetting his proud Rajput tradition "wielded the sword of Islam" and allowed women of his family to be lifted at will by alien Muslim rulers and nobility in India. He was therefore deeply hated by Rana Pratap. Once when he went to Rana Pratap's abode to negotiate on behalf of Akbar the brave and patriotic Rana of indomitable spirit refused to dine with Mansingh, a Muslim stooge, as he called him. After Mansingh's departure he had the earth at the meeting place dug up, purified and the utensils thoroughly cleansed and disinfected from the contagion of slavery. Mansingh's

sister was married to Jehangir while his father's sister was married to Akbar.

Mansingh was born at Ambar. He joined Akbar when his grandfather Bharmal surrendered his daughter to Akbar's harem. In 984 A.H. he was sent against Rana Pratap and in the next year he had to cross swords with the great Rana in the battle of Haldighat. When Bhagwandas (uncle of Mansingh) was appointed governor of Punjab Mansingh commanded the districts along the Indus. Later he was sent to restore order in Kabul. His uncle Bhagwandas disgusted with the treachery, debauchery and fanaticism at the Muslim court went mad, according to Abul Fazal, and later stabbed himself. At his death in 998 A.H. Mansingh succeeded to the title of Raja. On his Muslim subordinates complaining against him for not pandering to their fanaticism he was recalled from Kabul and appointed governor of Bihar to subdue patriotic and brave Hindu rulers of the region, like Puranmal and Raja Sangram. In the 35th year of Akbar's reign Mansingh was deputed to invade Orissa. He succeeded in wresting Jagannathpuri, the famous Hindu shrine for his Muslim overlord. When some Afghans attacked and desecrated Jagannathpuri for the umpteenth time, Mansingh led another attack on Orissa and annexed it to Akbar's empire. It was this Mansingh who owned the famous Taj Mahal in Agra. It was wrested from his grandson Jaisingh by Akbar's grandson Shahjahan to bury his wife Mumtaz in. Mansingh outlived Akbar, and died in the 9th year of Jehangir's reign. Since Jehangir had murdered

Manbai his wife who was Mansingh's sister Mansingh had plotted to prevent Jehangir from coming to the throne and proclaimed Jehangir's son Khusru emperor after Akbar's death.

Despite his having spent a whole lifetime in fighting Akbar's battles and indirectly helping the spread of Islam Mansingh was deeply hated by Akbar. Once during a drunken brawl Akbar had tried to throttle Mansingh. The latter was saved because of the intervention of some other courtiers then present. In 1605 Akbar wanted to poison Mansingh by administering him some poison pills. Unluckily for him however Akbar's perfidy boomeranged on himself. He had prepared two doses of pills looking alike. One contained poison while the other was a harmless dummy. Through oversight he swallowed the poison pills himself while passing on the innocuous ones to Mansingh in all confidence. The result was that Akbar died while Mansingh survived. Disgusted with the lecherous and treacherous atmosphere at the Muslim court Mansingh's son Jagat Singh and a number of other descendants drank themselves to death.

5. Mirza Aziz Koka was Akbar's foster brother. He rebelled against Akbar because of Akbar's despotic behaviour. Aziz Koka refused to have his horses branded with the imperial mark. Apprehensive of Akbar's vengeance he left for Diu on the pretext of capturing it from the Portuguese. But instead he set sail in 1593 for Mecca via Hedjaj with his many wives and a dozen sons and daughters to seek spiritual solace for his

harried soul. Far from getting any solace even there since he [22]"was shamelessly fleeced by the Muslim priests in the temple of Kaba in Mecca" he unwillingly returned to spend the rest of his life in Akbar's court thinking it to be a better place than Mecca, with his attachment to Islam much cooled down. "He died disgruntled, disappointed and disillusioned in the 19th year of Jehangir's reign, at Ahmedabad after many vicissitudes in his fortune.

6. Abdul Rahim Khan Khana was the son of Behram Khan. Four-year old Abdur Rahim's father Behram Khan was murdered at Akbar's instance though Behram Khan had been Akbar's faithful and zealous guardian. After the murder of Behram Khan the toddler Abdur Rahim was brought to Akbar's court along with his mother Salima Sultan who had thereafter willy nilly to play wife to Akbar. Unmindful of the murder of his father and abduction of his widowed mother by Akbar and inured to a treacherous court life Abdur Rahim spent his life-time fighting the battles of Akbar and relieving the sorrow and tedium of his life by writing poems. He was born at Lahore in 964 A. H. Abdur Rahim's motto was that one [23]"should hurt one's enemies under the mask of friendship". All charge him with maliciousness and faithlessness.' He lies buried in Delhi near the so-called Humayun's tomb in an erstwhile Hindu

---

22. Pp. 394-395, Vol. I, Akbar the Great, ibid. P. 345, Vol III, Ain-i Akbari, ibid
23. P. 360, Vol. III, Ain-i Akbari

mansion which he had occupied when living. He lies buried in his own residence. The Hindu Shakti hakra (the esoteric design made up of two interlocked triangles) may still be seen adorning each of the four facades of that mansion. From its dome, adorned with blue Hindu tiles (in the fashion of the Hindu palace in Gwalior fort), it is called Nila Burj by Muslims from the time that it came under their occupation.

7. Birbar is often referred to as Birbal in popular parlance. The two words are quite different. Birbar means a top-class warrior. Birbal means the strength (or grit) of a warrior. In contemporary Muslim chronicles the name Birbar is used. He was born in 1528 in a poor Brahmin family. His original name was Maheshdas. As a young boy he joined the entourage of Raja Bhagwandas of Ambar (Jaipur). When Akbar ascended the throne Bhagwandas presented Birbar to Akbar. At that time Maheshdas used to style himself as Brahmakavi (poet of the universe). He rose from a menial position at court to the rank of a grandee because in him Akbar found a ready tool and a perfect factotum ready to execute any job or man at Akbar's command. Like Abdur Rahim, Maheshdas also used to relieve the agony of his heart by composing poems. In 1574 he was sought to be foisted as the ruler of Nagarkot in supercession of Nagarkot's lawful ruler Jaichand. It was a common high-handed practice of Akbar to will away a reigning Hindu monarch's kingdom to his own puppet and set him up, backed with imperial Muslim might, as a rival of the reign-

ing Hindu king. It was in one such move that Birbar was instigated to lead an expedition to storm Nagarkot if he wanted to be acknowledged as its ruler. Birbar led the expedition in which the sacred Hindu idol in its main temple and the idol's canopy was riddled with Muslim missiles. The invaders slaughtered 200 cows and filling their shoes with the blood of the slaughtered cows splashed the temple walls. Despite such atrocities Birbar could not be foisted on the Nagarkot throne. As a sop he is said to have been offered some gold and a jagir at Kalanjar. But he was not permitted to enjoy even that. In 1583 he was ordered to lead an expedition against the rebellious Yusufzai Afghans on Hindusthan's northwest frontier. He was slain in that expedition. The self-appointed court chronicler Badayuni in rabidly fanatic and surly Islamic style remarks that "Birbal the infidel dog joined the other infidels in hell in just retribution for his many misdeeds." Badayuni uses the same intemperate and abusive language when referring to the death of any Hindu. For instance in referring to the deaths of Raja Bhagwandas and Todarmal in Lahore within five days of one another in November 1589, Badayuni pouts that the two [24] "hastened to the abode of hell and torment, and in the lowest pit became the food of serpents and scorpions. May God scorch them both." Badayuni seems to be unaware of the implication of his listing the Hindus who, according to him, went to hell. He could not have been so sure unless he himself was the first to arrive at the gate of hell to be able

24. P. 383, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle, ibid

to make a meticulous list of all the Hindus whom, he thought, a Muslim Allah consigned to the Islamic hell.

Some cheap stories of Akbar-Birbal repartees and witticisms current in India have been invented by some ingenious writer and added to from time to time by others, giving them a historical Akbar-Birbal background. The real Birbar led a horrid, precarious and deeply detested existence far removed from any humour or poetry.

8. Tansen was born sometime in 1531-32 in a Brahmin family in Behat village 28 miles from Gwalior. He received his early training in music in Gwalior which had a tradition of high class Hindu music. Tansen has attained legendary fame as a vocal musician par excellence. A saint musician, Haridas of Vrindavan, is also said to have imparted tuition in music to Tansen. He took up service as a court musician with Raja Ramchandra of Bhatha (modern Rewa). It was there that he received the title of Tansen because of his mastery in singing. In 1562 when Akbar invaded that Hindu kingdom Tansen was wrested away. Badayuni says, [25] "Tansingh did not wish to leave his royal Hindu patron. Finally (a fierce Muslim general) Jalal Khan Kurchi came, and brought him to a sense of duty." Tansen is often flaunted as an example of Akbar's encouragement to music. But that is a bogus claim. Tansen was already an accomplished musician before being dragged to Akbar's court. In fact his expertise in music

25. P. 345, ibid.

proved to be his undoing. Far from improving, Tansen's music lost its sacred Hindu character and acquired the profligacy of a court where music was associated with drunken revelries and prostitution. A disconsolate Tansen sobbed loudly and pitiously when abducted to Akbar's court as part of a huge ransom in men, women, gold, gems, cavalry and footmen that Ramchand had to surrender to buy peace from Akbar's ravaging armies. At Akbar's court Tansen came to grief. Stories of fanatic Muslims at court thrusting half-chewed filthy morsels of betel leaf from their own mouths into the mouth of Tansen opening to sing his melodies, may well be true. Shunned by orthodox Hindus and dragged and addressed as Miya in the Muslim style Tansen has been willy nilly represented as a Muslim though till the end of his life he remained a Hindu. He died in 1588 after a tormented career of twenty six years' forced singing at an alien monarch's court. He lies buried in an erstwhile temple pavilion near Mohammad Ghaus's temple-tomb at the foot of Gwalior fort. The entire area where these two lie buried is strewn with ruins of a huge temple complex ravaged in several centuries of Muslim onslaughts before Akbar. Like thousands of other sacred Hindu sites thrughout India and West Asia the temples at the foot of Gwalior fort too were reduced to a Muslim cemetery. They are not original Muslim tombs but misused Hindu temples.

9. Hakim Humam, the superintendent of Akbar's royal kitchen is also classified as one of the nine gems. It was but natural that he should

be bracketed as a 'gem' in a court where food and drink were highly coveted. As a kitchen superintendent he had to supervise the preparation of palatable dishes lest he lose his life. But Badayuni's statement that Akbar suspected [25]Hakim Humam to have poisoned him is evidence enough that Hakim Humam, like everybody else hated Akbar.

The very fact that Humam ie hardly ever mentioned in any standard history is eloquent proof of his insignificance. Thus the nine-gem story is a sheer invention of court-flatterers who sought their favour for self-aggrandizement.

Thus the so-called nine gems all turn out to be, on closer scrutiny, lustreless, base opportunists involuntarily embroiled in a game of mutual hate. They all led miserable lives disgusted with their lot. We have already quoted Akbar that he considered none of his courtiers to be worthy of any merit. On their part the courtiers too deeply hated Akbar as is reflected in their dealings with him. So, even the nine-gem story far from shedding any lustre on Akbar's regime, adds a new dimension to its notoriety.

25. Pp. 377-78, Vol. II, Badayuni's chronicle quoted by Dr. Shrivastava in Akbar the Great, Vol. 1, page 459.

Chapter XXIV

SCRIBES

In looking for contemporary records about Akbar's or for that matter of any Muslim's reign in India one comes across two contradictory statements. Writer after writer complains that no worthwhile records are available while it is also confidently asserted that a plethora of meticulous record of every word of Akbar was made but somehow it has all disappeared. Both these apparently irreconcilable statements, if understood in their proper context, are justified. This confusion will be apparent from Vincent Smith's dilemma.

Vincent Smith observes [1]"The historian who undertakes to deal with the life, character, and reign of···any...notable European sovereign of the 16th century, is confronted by a gigantic mass of State papers so voluminous that the lifetime of a diligent student hardly suffices to master the whole. The biographer of Akbar is in a position very different. The contents of even one record room have not survived The surviving documents of Akbar's reign...are not sufficient to justify the compilation of a separate catalogue (Footnote, Jarrett's translation of Ain-i Akbari vol ii, P.v: As a finished diplomatist his letters to recalcitrant generals and rebellious viceroys are Eastern models of astute persuasion, veiling threats with compli-

1. Introduction to Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

ments, and insinuating rewards and promises without committing his master to their fulfilment. But these epistles which form one of his monuments to fame, consist of interminable sentences, involved in frequent parentheses difficult to unravel, and paralleled in the West only by the decadence of taste, soaring in prose, as Gibbon justly remarks, to the vicious affectation of poetry, and in poetry sinking below the flatness and insipidity of prose... I have not felt bound to undertake the labour of examining the text of those difficult compositions)."

So even the scanty record that exists of Akbar's reign is all trash. What else can be expected of a regime of illiterate barbarians! Historians are mistaken in believing that there was much other record that used to be maintained. What has come down to us is all the record that was ever kept.

[2]"The lack of State papers dealing with the reign of Akbar is not due to any failure of his to keep a record of his sayings and doings. Each day while he was giving public audience watchful scribes standing below him committed to paper every word uttered by his august lips, and recorded with painstaking minuteness the most ordinary and trivial actions of his life."

Dowson says [3]"The letters are of a gossiping familiar character, and are embellished with plenty of verse; but they contain nothing of importance, and throw little light upon the political relations of

2. P. 2, ibid.
3. P. 147, vol. VI, Elliot and Dowson.

the time. All these letters were translated for Sir H. M. Elliot by Lt. Pritchard, and it is to be regretted that they were not more worthy of the labour bestowed upon them."

Apparently these modern writers of mediaeval history have been misled by contemporary statements of court scribes like Abul Fazal, and European visitors like Monserrate that a large group of Muslim scribes swarming around Akbar used to be on its tiptoes to take down every word of what he said. Those contemporary statements are perfectly true if understood in the proper context while the complaint of modern writers that there are no worthwhile records available is also justified.

Basically it is not true that meticulous records of all important transactions and every word that Akbar uttered were ever maintained. Maintenance of such records presupposes widespread literacy, respect for systematic administration, a progressed economy where reams of paper, pencils, fountain pens, ball pens, tape-recorders, teleprinters, quick-drying ink, printing press and fast means of communication are available. Even in the 20th century a country on the forefront of all-round technological advance, like the United States of America cannot confidently assert that every word of their President is meticulously recorded. How then is it ever believed that in an age when 99 percent of the Muslim junta which ruled India, was illiterate, when stationery in enough quantity was hard to come by, when ink had to be dried with a dash of sand every time a quill-pen was put to paper, when despotic rule could do without any

records and stenography was unknown, copious and exhaustive records were ever kept. It is also absurd to believe that while unimportant, long-winded letters alone of all court record have survived, the rest of the record has exclusively and mysteriously disappeared. The fact is that the letters that have come down to us constitute about all that was ever reduced to writing. The rest was all done verbally. That most transactions should be oral was necessitated by the very nature of the dealings at Muslim courts. It was all a medley of intrigue, lechery, treachery, faithlessness, bribery, corruption, nepotism, confusion, plotting and counterplotting and cringing flattery. In such a way of life there is no administration as such and therefore there are no records. The few letters that have come down to us had to be written to coax and cajole or threaten and control recalcitrant generals or rebels and imposters located far away from the capital. Therefore, modern historians can be dead sure that they have almost all the record of whatever was reduced to writing. There was nothing more and, therefore, the question of its being destroyed does not arise.

It would then be asked as to what should one make of confident assertions by contemporaries like Abul Fazal and Monserrate that meticulous records of all that transpired at court were assiduously maintained ? The explanation for the statements of contemporary Muslims is slightly different from that for statements by European visitors like Monserrate.

Court employees like Abul Fazal in order to

justify their existence and ensure an easy living for themselves, used to put up a show of being on their tiptoes to take down all that happened at court. Even if they had honestly desired to sweat it out and reduce to writing all that happened, as observed above, it was impossible and impracticable to reduce even a fraction of it to writing in the absence of mechanical means of phonography, stenography and the required stationery and the standard of literacy. Besides, the scribes were not at all interested in exerting themselves at keeping a meticulous record of all transactions. Thirdly it was also impolitic to reduce to writing the happenings at court which were mostly very dirty for any record. Despite all this, cringing scribes like Abul Fazal and Badayuni had to make a show of their being busily engaged in writing. After all who was to examine what they had written, how they had written or whether they had written anything at all ? There were no supervisers over them. There were no responsible, conscientious and educated superintendents. Like wayward students in a classroom who engage themselves in figure-drawing or useless scribbling to make the teacher believe that they are taking down diligent notes the scribes swarming around Akbar also avidly kept pushing their pens on parchment and nodding their heads in fawning and feigning appreciation of every word and deed of the sovereign. Actually they took down nothing. If at all, they just fiddled with their pens and parchment to draw some idle figures or record some imaginative words. If at times they did record something that was soon torn away or

destroyed after the make-believe was over. This is the reason why we have on record only letters which were actually written and dispatched.

Monserrate records that [4]Akbar "appoints four or five secretaries out af a body of scribes for duty each day. These secretaries write down all the business transacted by the king, all the measures he takes, and all the orders he issues They take down what he says with such speed that they appear carefully to catch and preserve his words before they can fall to the ground and be lost. (Footnote :—They were called Waqiah Nawis or script writers)."

We attach great value to the above observation being that of a third, disinterested party. But like all other evidence we insist that it should be properly analysed, sifted and understood.

Firstly, since Akbar liked to be surrounded by admiring multitudes the scribes used to be a part of that stage-setting.

Secondly, this pretension of being at the service of His Majesty was also to the advantage of the scribes because they got paid for it. Being near the sovereign and in his confidence inflated their ego and also gave them a certain advantage over the other courtiers. Being only a handful few who could just read and write and whose interests did not range very much beyond the Koran and other fanatic topics and court intrigue, they could

4. Pp. 205-206, the Commentarius, ibid.

hardly be expected to make any intelligent or intelligible notes.

They also couldn't be expected to be so foolhardy as to record anything which discredited the sovereign or any courtier even by implication.

Even if at times any scribe dared record anything deprecatory it was not retained without the sovereign's approval or consent. If at all any idiot of a scribe ventured to submit a written calumny or invective or derogatory note both he and his note could not escape being torn to pieces.

There were such heavy odds against any worth while records being kept during Muslim rule in India. Regimes thriving on murder and massacre ravage and plunder, treachery and lechery, drugging and drinking, tyranny and torture, could never dare or afford to maintain any records lest any such records fall into hostile hands or permanently discredit the regime in the eyes of posterity.

What then can be the import of Monserrate's personal observation? The answer is very simple. Monserrate being a stranger to Persian, to Muslim modes of behaviour, and to dealings in a Muslim court he couldn't know that the crowding and cringing scribes were mere showpieces to give a kick to the emperor's vanity, to overawe the courtiers and impress the public.

And yet we admire Monserrate's observation. Very sagaciously he has noted that from the speed of their writing "they appear carefully to catch and preserve his words." The word 'appear' implies a

non-commital, doubtful noting. We fully endorse Monserrate's observation. In our view too the scribes swarming around the emperor simulated all the motions of pen-pushers without ever really recording anything or pushing their pens very far.

This should awaken students or researchers of history to the fact that every mediaeval statement needs to be properly understood in the relevant context of the times. When it was made and why and by whom it was made should be considered. Such analysis would often reveal that their statements either connote nothing or sometimes they ostensibly mean the very contrary of their superficial import.

Most modern scholars place great reliance on Abul Fazal's Akbarnama even though they seem to be aware that he was a thoroughly unreliable flatterer. In considering the Ain-i-Akbari alias Akbarnama as a fairly reliable record of Akbar's reign they attach great importance to the fact that "[5]the Akbarnama was written by Abul Fazal in obedience to an imperial order and partly revised by Akbar himself (Ain Vol. iii, p. 414)".

We wish to strongly emphasize, however, that the very fact that Akbarnama was subject to Akbar's revision renders it all the more worthless and dangerous with regard to any claims made in Akbar's favour.

What is the worth of a document authored by a cringing flatterer to start with and then censored

5. P. 4, Akbar the Great Mogul, by V. Smith, ibid.

by the flattered despot? Thus we find that many basic concepts of Indian historical research are all topsy turvy. They ought to be put right side up before aspiring to get to the right conclusions from them. We have already proved in our book titled "Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research" that buildings and townships attributed to different Muslim rulers were in fact devastated by them. Similarly here we have proved that a chronicle subjected to a Muslim ruler's approval makes it all the more worthless.

It may then be despaired that since such historical concoctions are all the record we have, should we give up reconstructing mediaeval history? We assure the reader that there is absolutely no cause for despair. Human ingenuity and intelligence are not so shallow as to be left blinking or blanked when confronted with fabrications. Bring to mind the methods of criminal investigation used to unravel mystery murders, or expose clever forgeries. Such crimes themselves contain seeds of the truth. Investigation starts with an initial doubt and suspicions. Various possibilities are carefully checked against the matter under investigation. As the investigation proceeds tiny, flimsy clues first make their appearance. Perspicacity and perseverance in following that trail ultimately lead to a graphic exposition of the dark deed to the clarity of broad daylight.

Indian historical research has gone awry all these centuries, and has burdened historical texts with illogical conclusions precisely because the

unfailing and salubrious methods of criminal investigation and legal adjudication have been shunned or ignored with academic naivete or helplessness. History text books have been fashioned on pathetically trusted questionable writings. No serious or conscious attempt seems to have been made to investigate all their connotations. It was perhaps never even dreampt that mediaval assertions could mean the very opposite of their superficial import.

It is the absence of such awareness that makes most writers contradict themselves in first cautioning the reader against believing the unreliability of Muslim chroniclers' words, and then proceeding to write authoritative history on the basis of fraudulent chronicles.

Some readers might inadvertently lay the same charge at our door. Therefore we would like to illustrate our position. When a murderer plants a forged suicide note on his victim we make use of that forged note as very valuable evidence to implicate him both for investigating the mode and motive of his crime. But merely because we use his forgery against the forger he doesn't get the right to insist that we admit its contents to be true. Contrarily the very fact of fabrication should caution the history researcher to be chary in drawing any conclusions. History research conducted along such guidelines will be found to bring out disarmingly accurate conclusions even from the very dross-heap of bafflingly concocted chronicles.

One need not therefore, be scared or feel disheartened and helpless in dealing with Muslim chroniclers. Fot instance when a rabid and fanatic Badayuni dubs every dead Hindu a dog who went to hell we are not bound to believe it until we assure ourselves that Badayuni himself had been tethered at the gates of hell to scare away Muslims by his barks in coreligious comradery and wag in the Hindus. But when Badayuni dubs a colleague-chronicler like Abul Fazal as a "shameless flatterer" we can safely assume it to be the gospel truth, supported by our own appraisal of his life and writings, and bolstered by the unanimous judgment of almost all historians The misleading objection that if we doubt Muslim chroniclers' writings we must not rely on any part of them, therefore, turns out to be untenable. On the contrary human intelligence demands that we separate the chaff of falsehood from the grain of truth with the sieve of careful investigation.

We fully agree with all researchers of Indian history that concocted Muslim chronicles are the only source material available. Even so we want to reassure them that that source material itself is a very valuable help to accurately reconstruct mediaeval history just as diamonds are found by sifting heaps of coal, and radium is extracted from piles of slag.

During such examination when we assess the role of the scribes dancing attendance in Muslim courts we find that primarily they were meant to be mere show-pieces or human embellishments.

Though appearing to be avidly pushing their pens they actually recorded nothing worthwhile.

The chronicles that have come down to us were written by them at their own leisure from their own fancy or were dictated to them by the soverign himself or by his confidant courtiers at their leisure and pleasure.

We also get to know from Abul Fazl that these chronicles or parts of them are also the products of the interplay of the emperor's fancy and that of his fawning chronicler. That is to say when Abul Fazal tells us that many a time Akbar examined, corrected, supplemented, approved or altered his writings we fully believe him. In fact we conclude from it that all Muslim scribes had to get their writings censored by their court-patrons.

That is why we find scribes like Kamgar Khan writing a whole fake Jehangirnama to oblige an aggrieved Shahjahan.

For the same reason we also find confirmed drunkards and dope-addicts like Jehangir and Akbar ranting lustily in sanctimonious horror against the consquences of those vices.

We would therefore, like to alert every truth-seeking historian against believing even a word of the sanctimonious sayings of a Jehangir or Akbar, Ferozshah or Sher Shah, Tamerlain or a Tughlak.

The roads, buildings, canals, bridges, serais, poor houses, gardens, towers and tombs attributed to them are all plagiarised Hindu property.

Statements about Akbar having abolished the Jiziya or banned the Sati system are all pious, panegyric humbug.

They are all written by the scribe from his own fancy, or first concocted by him. and then amended, altered, improved upon and approved by a presumptuous courtier or monarch.

Badayuni has unwittingly let us into the secret of Muslim chronicle-writing by revealing that when the Akbarnama was being written a courtier came and ordered him to record that Akbar had founded a magnificent township called Nagarchain. Poor Badayuni carried out the imperial order but added his own reservation that he had never come across even the slightest trace of it.

Abul Fazal, the doyen of Muslim chroniclers is rightly regarded as an arch flatterer. It was his consummate skill in double-distilled limpid flattery that won him a pre-eminent position among Muslim chroniclers. He succeeded remarkably in his grand strategy of hitching the band wagon of his heraldic flattery to Akbar's imperial train, and forging a life-long link for ensuring his own continued security, prosperity, commanding authority, and sensuous pleasure-steeped life at court.

Even a cursory reading of Abul Fazl's Ain-i-Akbari would reveal to the reader how it is nothing but abject and baseless flattery heaped pile upon pile and tier upon tier, from cover to cover and beginning to end.

We give below a few illustrative extracts :—

"[6]His Majesty is a great friend of good order and propriety in business. [7]The Gulal-bar is a grand enclosure—the invention of His Majesty.

"[8]His Majesty has invented a candlestick one yard high.

"[9]His Majesty has composed more than 200 tunes.

"[10]In the course of 24 hours His Majesty eats but once and leaves off before he is fully satisfied." (We wonder what made him so abstemious when he spent a lifetime in torturous extortion of morsels of food from the mouths of millions).

"[11]His Majesty cares very little for meat," (This is a typically inane sentence which doesn't mean a thing).

"[12]His Majesty has such a knowledge of the science of music as trained musicians did not possess". (Who was his tutor and when did Akbar find time to study music in the din of war drums and the horrid shrieks of the millions who were tortured. And if he was after all such an accomplished musician did he conduct any concerts or open any imperial music schools?.)

6. Ain 15, Ain-i Akbari, Vol. iii, ibid
7. Ain 16.
8. Ain 18.
9. Ain 19.
10. Ain 23.
11. Ain 26.
12. P. 54

"[13]His Majesty does not drink much but pays great attention to this (Abdar Khana) matter. (What made him pay special attention to drinks if he didn't drink much?).

"[14]His Majesty's clothes becomingly fit everyone whether he be tall or short. (That implies that Akbar possessed miraculous powers so as to impart to his robes the magic quality of shrinking or expanding to fit anybody. Thank God we are not told that His Majesty's robes also fitted mules and asses or panthers and hyenas).

"[15]His Majesty pays much attention to both (painting and writing) and is an excellent judge of form and thought. (Then who did the fighting ?)

"[16]His Majesty's library is divided into several parts, some of the books are kept within and some without the harem. (Who did the selection of books and who read them within the exclusive privacy of Akbar's harem when Akbar and his 5000 abducted consorts were stark illiterates ?)

[17]"His Majesty has made several inventions which have astonished the whole world." (We are astonished that not even one has come down in any part of the world as an Akbar's patent. And when did he find the time to make all those inventions, torn between a thousand wars and 5000 warring consorts ?)

13. P. 57, ibid.
14. P. 96, ibid.
15. P. 103, ibid.
16. P. 109, ibid.
17. Ain 36.

"[18]His Majesty has invented guns which can be fired without a match...Balls (of a particular size) no one but His Majesty would dare to fire.

"[19]His Majesty has invented a wheel, which when set in motion, enables cleaning 16 barrels at a time.

"[20]His Majesty mounts every kind of elephant.

"[21]His Majesty has wonderful knowledge of kine-breeding.

"[22]It is beyond my power to describe in adequate terms His Majesty's devotions."

"[23]The good habits of His Majesty are so numerous that I cannot adequateiy describe them."

"[24]His Majesty gives satisfactory answers to everyone."

"[25]A recluse had cut off his tongue and throwing it towards the threshold of the palace wished that if Akbar be a prophet 'my tongue would be restored.' The day was not ended before he obtained his wish."

"[26]His Majesty even learned alchemy, and showed in public some of the gold made by him."

18. P. 120, ibid.
19. P. 122.
20. P. 138.
21. P. 158.
22. P. 163.
23. P. 165.
24. P. 173.
25. P. 173.
26. P. 324.

Akbar was certainly an adept at looting gold through plunder campaigns all over India and therefore had enough of that metal to display any quantity, anytime to anybody. Thus goes Abul Fazal on and on merrily in an unending and unflagging strain of unabashed panegyric chanting 'His Majesty...His Majesty' ad nauseam and projecting His Majesty as a saint, a cattle-breeder, elephant-tamer, gun-maker, versatile-inventor, alchemist, miracleman and everything else in the world except a drunkard, womanizer, massacrer, Hindu-hater and plunderer– which he really was.

It is a pity that this fabric of flattery is regarded by several historians as a chronicle par excellence. They seem to be unaware of the sweet falsehoods packed into those bulging three volumes of the Akbarnama.

It must be, however, conceded in all fairness to the full credit of mediaeval Muslim chroniclers that in one solitary respect they are downright honest. They pull no punches and mince no words in expressing their off the cuff, straight from the shoulder, honest and heartfelt, fanatic full-throated Islamic hatred of Hindudom, so much so that instead of calling Hindus by that bland, insipid matter-of-fact name, Muslim chroniclers designate them by such colourful and endearing terms as infidels, thieves, robbers, dacoits, slaves, dogs, prostitutes, scum, filth and scoundrels. In that same honest tradition they frankly gloat over the rape, plunder and massacre of Hindus. This may be illustrated from Niamatulla's Tarikh-i-Khan Jahan Lodi (Vol. VI, E and D) in which with disarmingly brutal

and murderous frankness he describes how throughout Sikandar Lodi's reign that august Muslim monarch busied himself with 'butchering' Hindus.

Wading through the mire of these fraudulent chronicles we have pointed out how Akbar turns out to be a man of every conceivable vice and undesirable trait of character.

From this it may be realized how dangerous it is to name any public institutions after Akbar.

Individual names when associated with public projects are intended to be memory-aids to inspire posterity.

In what respect will posterity be inspired after knowing the facts about Akbar?

Akbar's sordid career had remained not only carefully shrouded but was even presented in raiment of glory because his descendants continued to rule a major part of India for 253 years.

That same deception and travesty is still being continued only because long usage and repetition has invested it with the aura of truth.

At least in India false notions of communal parity and amity parading in the guise of secularism, have tended to hoist the name of Akbar at least as high as that of Ashok, on the misleading axiom that the great Hindu king Ashok must have a Muslim counterpart. Akbar has been dressed up to fit that role.

We have come across a mobile van named after Akbar carrying social service to villages. The

villagers eagerly flock around the Akbar Van in blissful ignorance of the fact that their own forbears used to flee in terror at Akbar's approach.

If any hotel is sought to be named after Akbar, what amenities it will have to have is indicated by Akbar's own self-styled chronicler, Abul Fazal. He says "His Majesty (Akbar) has established a wine shop near the palace. The prostitutes of the realm who had collected could scarcely be counted, so large was their number. If any well known courtiers wanted to have a virgin they would first have His Majesty's permission. In the same way boys prostituted themselves, and drunkenness and ignorance soon led to bloodshed. His Majesty himself called some of the principal prostitutes and asked them who deprived them of their virginity" The calibre of a monarch who has the time and taste to keep a count of his realm's myriad prostitutes and their virgin daughters, and is anxious to inquire from each one of them, about the violation of their virginity may well be imagined.

Any way, we wonder whether the manager of any hotel would like or be expected to carry on and preside over the kind of imperial amenities initiated and patronized by Akbar himself!

Vincent Smith quotes Wheeler that "Akbar kept a poisoner in pay", whose duty it was to poison unwanted persons. Should not all hotels named after Akbar, have such an official too!

Such are the onerous responsibilities which flow from the name of Akbar. If they are carried to their logical conclusion public life would stink

If at all any public institution has to be named after Akbar it can only be a brothel, not a hotel.

It is, therefore, very essential that historical accounts conform to facts, and not be patterned on fantasies.

It is also essential that accentuated communalism parading under a secular garb, and passing fancied needs of political expediency are not allowed to manhandle or mishandle history.

It is in this context that we thought it essential to put the record of Akbar's history straight.

Chapter XXV

AKBAR TOMB IS A HINDU PALACE

That Akbar was hated by all around him and that they regarded his death as a good riddance is reflected even in the manner of his burial.

Vincent Smith says [1]"the obsequies of the dead lion were hurried and perfunctory. A gap was made in the fort according to custom (Crooke, Introduction to Popular Religion and Folklore of N. India, 1894, p. 219, Popular Religion & C, 1896, Vol. ii, p. 56, Dubois, Hindu Manners, etc. third ed. (Beauchamp), 1906, p. 499, Jataka translation. Rouse and Cowell 1895, Vol. ii, p.55)...and the body was interred in the sepulchre at Sikandra."

Had Akbar been loved and respected he would not have had a hurried and perfunctory burial.

But besides that we have another very important point in this connection. It is our contention that posterity has been misled and hoodwinked even regarding the place of Akbar's death. The traditional account that Akbar died in the Red Fort in Agra is not correct. Had he died there his burial six miles away at Sikandra would never be termed hurried and perfunctory. In such a case there is an obvious void in the statement that his body was taken out of a gap in the fort and interred six miles away.

1. P. 236, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid.

The very authorities quoted by Vincent Smith above are all later European writers. That shows that the belief that Akbar died in the Red Fort (Agra) is mere rumour and myth not based on even one contemporary authentic source. In fact the tiny detail that Akbar's body was not brought out of any gate but was clandestinely removed through a hole in the wall bears out Smith's observation that Akbar's burial was hurried and perfunctory. We add from Smith's observation that Akbar's burial was also secret. Such secrecy, hurry and perfunctoriness is possible only if Akbar is buried in the very mansion in which he lay ill. Our conclusion, therefore, that Akbar died in the very six-storeyed Hindu usurped palace at Sikandra where he lies buried is thus based on sound logic.

The fact that his burial was hurried and perfunctory makes it clear that he was buried at the very spot where he lay dying. Since he is buried in Sikandra it is our contention that he died in Sikandra. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that Akbar lies buried in a six-storeyed Hindu palace. He happened to die when he was camping there.

Had he died in the Red Fort in Agra there was no reason why his body should have been removed by breaking open a wall instead of being carried out through the fort's main gate.

The canard that Akbar's dead body was removed from the fort, unknown to the public, through a specially made secret opening in the wall, was invented to hide the fact that he died in

the very palace where he lies buried, and that there was no funeral procession. That Akbar's body was removed by breaking open a fort wall can be accepted only if it is proved that the corpses of his father Humayun and grand father Babur were also removed by breaking open the walls of the mansions where they died. Since there is no such precedent the claim that Akbar's body alone was taken out through a hole in the wall for no rime or reason, is untenable.

Even conceding that it was taken out through a hole people were bound to throng round it if the body were to be carried to Sikandra six miles away. It would have then made a long and lengthy procession. In that case the burial could not be called "hurried and perfunctory."

There is yet another deeper mystery. Akbar's fancied grave is empty. It does not contain his remains at all. Vincent Smith quotes[2] the Venetian Manucci to say that "In 1691 during his campaign against the Marathas (in the Deccan) Aurangzeb received a report that certain turbulent Jat villagers had desecrated the tomb (of Akbar) and scattered his ancestor's bones. They pillaged the mausoleum breaking in the great bronze gates, tearing away the ornaments of gold, silver and precious stones and destroying wantonly what they could not carry off...Dragging out the bones of Akbar, they threw them angrily in the fire and burnt them. The pilgrim to Akbar's tomb visits, although he does not know it, an empty grave (Manucci, i. 142, ii. 320)."

2. P. 237, Akbar the Great Mogul, ibid

Thus even Akbar's ghost continues to mislead people. The hoax about Akbar's tomb has many ramifications namely :—

(1) His fancied grave is empty and doesn't contain his remains.

(2) Jehangir who hated Akbar and who wanted to kill Akbar by poison or in open combat may himself have caused Akbar's remains to be burnt in the 'hurried and perfunctory' obsequies

(3) Akbar's so-called tomb was obviously not built over his dead body, because it is a six storeyed Hindu palace consisting of hundreds of rooms, a basement, and huge grounds enclosed by a battlemented wall. The massive wall has towering gates on all the four sides as was common with Hindu buildings.

(4) A mere tomb which is haunted by fakirs, mendicants and other riff-raff would never have embellishments of gold, silver and gems. The wealth referred to forms part of the tradition of that building because before Muslim usurpation that Hindu palace did contain all that wealth.

(5) Carved all over on the walls of the palace are Hindu Shakti-chakra (interlocked-triangles) symols and wheel motifs.

(6) Its name could not have been Sikandra had it been built as a mausoleum for Akbar. Its name Sikandra derives from Sikandar Lodi who lived there three generatious before Akbar.

It was he who named the usurped Hindu palace after himself. That name still sticks even After Akbar's burial there.

(7) To cover up the fact that the Sikandra palace existed before Akbar died, and that no mausoleum was built for him, a cock and bull story has been planted in history saying that during his own life time Akbar himself chose the Sikandra site for his burial and started building his own palatial tomb. The question then arises that if Akbar was so eager to build his own tomb why didn't he jump into his grave as soon as he dug it? What exposes this fraud even more convincingly is that this same cock and bull story of every Muslim digging his own grave and building his own mausoleum in anticipation of his death is repeated once too often. Thus we are told that Hoshang Shah built his own tomb in Mandavgarh; Ghias uddin Tughlak who was murdered by his son within five years of his accession had within that short duration constructed his own imposing mausoleum in Delhi, that Sher Shah was hardly on the throne for five years when he died of burns caused by exploding gunpowder. But even before that he had already constructed his own grave at far away Sahasram in Bihar; Humayun regained entry to Delhi in July 1555 after a 15-year exile and[3] died with-

3 P 305, part II, Archaeological Remains, Monuments and Museums, published in 1964, by the Director General of Archaeology in India, New Delhi-11

in six months of his arrival, but within that short interval, we are solemnly told, he had already designed his tomb. Lest somebody ask whether an uneducated Humayun was an architect we are told that he must have learnt Persian architecture in the desert-wastes of Sind and Persia at a time when he wandered in tattered clothes without any shelter over his head or a morsel of food in his stomach.

One wonders whether the Persians had set up any school of architecture in the desert for an uncouth, wandering Humayun to study at.

The canard that Akbar built his own mausoleum is therefore part of a set formula of Muslim chronicle-writing trick.

In a Government of India publication the author contradicting Emperor Jehangir confidently tells us that[4] "The construction of his own tomb by Akbar at Sikandra near Agra had been going on for three years when death overtook him. Jehangir did not like its design and changed it. He completed the tomb in 1613, in the seventh year of his reign." The same mausoleum constructed for three years first by Akbar and then again by Jehangir, also for three years is one of those fishy slips which always betray fabrication.

We are at a loss to know which chronicler's fertile brain invented that canard since nowhere has Akbar said that he ever thought of building his own mausoleum.

4. P. 313, Part II, ibid.

And yet even that canard is not allowed to rest in peace. Up comes Jehangir with the claim that it was he who built his father's tomb.

Jehangir claims[5] "On Tuesday the 17th, I went on foot to see the resplendent sepulchre of my father. If I could, I would travel this distance upon my eye-lashes or my head. My father when he made a vow respecting my birth, had gone on foot from Fathpur to Ajmer on a pilgrimage to the shrine of the great Khwaja Muinuddin Chisti, a space of 120 kos, and it would therefore be nothing very great if I were to go this short distance upon my head or eyes. When I had obtained the good fortune of visiting the tomb and had examined the building which was erected over it I did not find it to my liking. My intention was, that it should be so exquisite that the travellers of the world could not say they had seen one like it in any part of the inhabited earth. While the work was in progress, in consequence of the rebellious conduct of the unfortunate Khusru, I was obliged to march towards Lahore. The builders had built it according to their own taste, and had altered the original design at their discretion. The whole money had thus been expended, and the work had occupied three or four years. I ordered that clever architects acting in concert with some intelligent persons, pull down the objectionable parts which I pointed out. By degrees a very large and magnificent building was raised, with a nice garden round it, entered by

5. P. 319, Vol VI, E & D. Wakiat-i-Jehangiri published by Kitab Mahal (P) Ltd. 56-A Zero Road, Allahabad, 1964.

a lofty gate, consisting of minarets made of white stone. The total expenses of this large building was reported to me to amount to 50,000 tumans of Irak, and 45 lacs of Khanis of Turan."

In order to accomodate the contradictory claims of Akbar and Jehangir having built one and the same Sikandra mausoleum another disarmingly naive canard is foisted on history. It says that Jehangir completed the mausoleum begun by his own father Akbar.

It is conveniently forgotten that Jehangir doesn't say that he completed a half-built tomb. On closer examination of Jehahgir's assertion his claim too turns out to be bogus.

His statement that he had entrusted the work to architects who altered the design is patently false because in those days when anybody's eyes could be gouged for even the slightest slip or disobedience who dared trifle with any approved plan of Akbar's mausoleum ?

Even if there were any dare-devil architect idiotic enough to flout a cruel Jehangir's chosen building design what interest would he have in substituting that design with one of his own fancy ? After all the architect couldn't be another son of Akbar who could be adamant about having his own design in place of the Jehangir's approved design for his father's tomb.

If at all somebody did obstinately construct a mausoleum which angered Jehangir what punishment did he mete out to the erring men, since

Jehangir was known to skin alive people for the slightest slip or defiance ? Since he does not mention having punished the erring workmen Jehangir's claim is a hoax and a fraud.

Another fishy detail is Jehangir's reference to certain 'objectionable parts' which he ordered to be pulled down. This lets out the cat out of the bag completely. The objectionable motifs he refers to were obviously those of a Hindu palace. In spite of his having chiselled away some Hindu images and motifs Akbar's second-hand mausoleum is still replete with Hindu wheel symbols and interlocked triangles(Shakti-chakras). No reference is made to the man who altered the design or to one who set it right.

Jehangir's vague reference to the building being 'completed' in three or four years and his quoting the cost not in Indian currency but in two foreign currencies all expose the falsity of his claim. The figure of expenditure is a concoction

Sir H. M. Elliot in his commentry on Jehangir's chronicle has pointed out from page to page how it is a tissue of lies from beginning to end. He has also cautioned the reader against Jehangir's unctuous and sanctimonious references feigning the deepest reverence for his father. But Jehangir's hatred for his father Akbar was so intense that he had made attempts to murder Akbar.

So, the hoax of Akbar's greatness stretches upto his very grave. He lies, or once lay, in a second-hand usurped Hindu palace, and not in any specially built mausoleum.

The ruins of the ancient Hindu township of which the palace formed the focal point, may still be seen around.

Our object in rewriting Akbar's chapter in Indian history in all such detail, has been to rebut a major falsification. Our aim has been to present the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about Akbar's character, life, reign, death and burial.

We are afraid we may not have been able to extract and present the whole horrid Truth from under the piles of flattery heaped by fawning chroniclers.

But so far as possible we have tried to piece together and expose the falsity of Akbar's usual image, and bring out a coherent and logical account of Akbar's diabolical role from his cradle to his grave.

How far we have succeeded it is for the readers to judge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) 'Akbar', by J. M. Shelat, 1964 A.D., Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chowpatty, Bombay-7

(2) 'Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan', in two volumes, by Lt-Col. James Tod, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. London.

(3) 'Akbar the Great Mogul', by Vincent Smith, 2nd edition, revised Indian reprint, 1958 A.D. S. Chand & Co. Delhi.

(4) 'Memoirs of Jehiruddin Mohammad Babur', translated by John Leyden & William Erskine, annotated and revised by Sir Lucas King, in two volumes, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921, A. D.

(5) Crescent in India, by S. R. Sharma, Hind Kitab Ltd., Bombay-1, 1966, A. D.

(6) Muntakhabut Tawarikh by Abdur Qadr ibn Muluk Shah alias al Badayuni, translated from the original Persian, and edited by Georgs S. A. Ranking, printed by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Baptist Mission Press, 1898 A. D.

(7) 'Akbar the Great', Vol 1, political history, 1542-1605 A.D., by Ashirbadi Lal Shrivastava, Shiv Lal Agarwala & co. (P) Ltd. publishers, Agra.

(8) 'The Taj and its Environments', by Moulvi Moinuddin Ahmad, 2nd edition, printed by R.G. Bansal & Co., 139 Kasairat Bazar, Agra.

(9) 'The 19th Century & After', a monthly review edited by James Knowles, Volume VIII, article titled 'The Taj & its Designers,' by E.B. Havell.

(10) 'The Transactions of the Archaeological Society of Agra', January to June 1878.

(11) Keene's Handbook for Visitors to Agra and its Neighbourhood, (Thacker's Handbook of Hindustan, rewritten and brought up-to-date by E. A, Duncan)

(12) 'The Badshahnama', by Mulla Abdul Hamid Lahori (Elliot & Dowson).

(13) 'History of the Rise of the Mohammedan Power in India, till the year 1612 A. D. translated from the original Persian of Mohammad Karim Ferishta, by John Briggs, Vol. II, published by S. Dey, 52-A Shambazar Street, Calcutta-4 (Reprinted 1966 A. D.)

(14) 'Ain-i-Akbari', by Abul Fazal Allami, translated from the original Persian, by H. Blochmann, second edition, Bibliotheca Indica Series, published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

(15) 'The Commentary', Commentarius of Father Monserrate, S. J. on his journey to the court of Akbar, translated from the original Latin by J. S. Hoyland, annotated by S. Banerjee, 1922, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London

(16) 'Sarvadeshik', Hindi weekly, dated April 14, 1968, published by Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Dayanand Bhawan, Ramlila Maidan, New Delhi.

ERRATA

Page	*Line*	*Incorrect*	*Correct*
25	14	aboiished	abolished
30	10	Tansen the	(In 1562 Tansen the famous musician was surrendered)
30	16	Bharmol	Bharmal
31	2	Muslim rule.	Muslim rule)
126	Heading	SO:CALLED	SO-CALLED
153	Heading	PLUNDR	PLUNDER
163	15	becasue	because
170	18	the	he
178	20	paid	pain
197	30	rhat	that
225	24	innumerabie	innumerable
228	8	fanatie	fanatic
229	29	pretentions	pretensions
231	29	whish	which
238	9	be	he
239	12	Jisziya	Jiziya
244	28	amognst	amongst
250	28	ot	at
251	8	tho	the

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
285	23	42	142
287	8	forward	forward.
287	14	Mohnerd	Mohammad
287	18	Fougnt	Fought.
295	Footnote	Niznuaddin's	Nizamuddin's
301	19	statutes	statues
304	9	Vagueness	vagueness
316	30	gavə	gave
323	21	Rodolfus	Rudolfus
331	5	excellant	excellent
346	11	Gujerrat	Gujerat
368	8	ie	is

SELECTIVE INDEX

Other Books by the Same Author

(May be had from N-128 Greater Kailas-I New Delhi-48, or other publishers)

1. *Taj Mahal was A Rajput Palace*, Rs.3.50 (author's own publication now out of print).
2. *The Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace*, Rs. 3.75, India Book House 249 Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji Road, Bombay-1.
3. ताजमहल राजपूती महल था, की ४ रु०, सूर्य प्रकाशन, नई सड़क, दिल्ली-६.
4. *Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research*, price Rs. 15/- (Author's own publication), constitutes a blueprint for re-writing Indian and world history.
5. भारतीय इतिहास की भयंकर भूलें, की १० रु०, सूर्य प्रकाशन, नई सड़क, दिल्ली-६
6. *The Rationale of Astrology*, price Rs. 12.50, author's own publication. It is a lucid and disarmingly simple guide for both beginners and experts in astrology. It also has has a chapter proving that the so-called Kutub Minar is an ancient Hindu astronomical tower.
7. हिंदुस्थानाचे दुसरे स्वातंत्र्ययुद्ध, price Rs. 7/- Mangal Sahitya Prakashan (now defunct) Poona-4. This book is in Marathi, and has received several literary awards. It is a complete and

fascinating account of the Indian National Army's fight for freedom, led by Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose; its backdrop and aftermath. (Now out of print)

8. नेताजींचे सहवासांत, price Rs. 3/-Manohar Granthmala, Wangmai Shobha Karyalaya, Tilak Road, Poona-2. This book is in Marathi. It has received literary awards. (Now out of print).

REVIEWS AND REACTION

The extent to which this author's two books: The Taj Mahal Was A Rajput Palace (a successor volume of which has been brought out under the title: The Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace, by the I,.dia Book House, 249 Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji Road, Bombay-1 and 'Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research', have unsettled current by the historical concepts the world over, may be judged following reviews and reactions :-

1. **Dr. K. Vaidyanathan** M.A. Ph.D. Madras;- "It is not so much the Taj Mahal but it is your book on the Taj Mahal which is the eighth wonder of the world."

2. **Barat Jyoti** (Sunday edition of the English daily, the Free Press Journal, Dalal Street, Bombay -1) dated August 27, 1967 : "P. N. Oak is emerging as a popular writer on different aspects of Indian history and culture. In addition to his few but quite sensational publications, Oak's articles have found their way into weeklies monthlies and dailies in both English and regional languages. There are (people) who look upon him as a veritable Vyasa reborn to reinstate the glory of Hindu heritage so grossly and callously misrepresented by wicked foreigners and their ignorant disciples...Oak is absolutely right when he points out that the term Arya has been misunderstood to be a racial term..."

3. **Mother India** (English Monthly edited by Mr. Baburao Patel, M.P., 55 Sir Pherozshah Mehta Road, Bombay-1), December 966, page 15 : "Missing...the two books is missing the most exciting and shocking story of the stupendous fraud two invading races...the Moghuls and the British... perpetrated on the helpless Indian people for over twelve centuries. Only after India got freedom, the sensational disclosures contained in the two books could be made. These books must be read by intelligent people. The books provoke thought, and with new thought old history begins to assume a different complexion."

4. **Sunday Standard (Indian Express,)** February 12, 1967 : "Mr. Oak's 'Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research' is a book of a baffling kind. There was so much of integrity and conviction in his presentation that he upset rather my equilibrium."

5. **Mr. Biswanath Das,** Governor, Uttar Pradesh, in His Excellency's letter dated March 23, 1966, from Lucknow : "I welcome the publication of the work 'Taj Mahal Was A Rajput Palace' ...a powerful plea proving the Taj as having been built by a Rajput king as his palace in pre-Muslim times. The author basis his conclusions on certain documents of historicity."

6. **Dr. M. Flagmeier,** President, The American Society for Scandinavian and Eastern Studies, Minnesota, U.S.A., in his letter dated December 6, 965, writes "We have long held in contempt the absurd notion that ShahJehan built the Taj

Mahal. Your scholarly investigations have bolstered our own theories, and you are to be commended for the clarity with which you have presented this new and refreshing revision of a turbulent chapter of Indian history. I first became acquainted with this problem when I was stationed in India. On one of my furloughs I was able to travel to Agra and see the Taj with my own eyes. Upon seeing this lovely structure, I was struck by its magnificent grandeur. I was struck by the fact that in spite of certain Moghul superficialities, this was NOT a Moghul building. For instance the fourminarets reminded me of pictures I had seen of Hindu architecture in what was then known as Rajputana. Also the octagonal design is definitely of Hindu origin. Our library recently acquired your wonderful little book, and some of these things which had been puzzling me were immediately cleared up."

7. **The Astrological Magazine** (Editor, Mr B.V. Raman, Sri Rajeswari, Bangalore 20) January 1966 : "Here is a publication (Taj Mahal Was a Rajput Palace) which may well claim to rouse one from a slumber of years. (It) deserves to be read with close attention both by the serious student of history and the lay man."

8. **The Deccan Herald** (English daily, Bangalore), June 4, 1967 : "This (Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research) is a thoroughly interesting book which propounds a revolutionary theory on the researches so far made in Indian history, and makes an entirely new approach to the subject. From the explanations Mr. Oak offers of

his theory in respect of the more important and better-known of (the mediaeval) monuments one is led irresistibly to believe that there is sound rationale behind it which is difficult to rebut. Mr. Oak's views and conclusions cannot be dismissed as those of an amateur because he is a trained and experienced research worker who has spent considerable time and effort and labour to delve deep into the implications of the theory he has evolved. Mr. Oak's is a challenging book and will repay close and earnest study by everyone interested in authentic Indian history and by every student of research into that history. In any event it certainly impresses very clearly the need for further research into the theory adumbrated and explained so elaborately by him, and for a change in the approach of historians and research workers."

9. **Organiser** (English weekly, Marina Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1), dated January 1, 1967 : "Such a book (Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research) requires a lot of courage and lot of scholarship."

10. **Searchlight** (English daily, Patna), dated September 25, 1966 : "Mr. Oak has launched himself upon the project of rewriting Indian history with a bang claiming that the Taj Mahal had not been built by the Moghul emperor Shahjahan."

11. **Dr. M. Flagmeier** (U.S.A.) : "You are to be congratulated upon a true masterpiece of scholarly inquiry (Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research)."

12. **Times of India** (English daily, Bombay, New Delhi), dated December 3, 1967 : "Mr. Oak

in the book 'Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research' has selected eighteen such blunders and has advanced various reasons to substantiate his contention. This is a thought-provoking treatise and and although one may not agree with his views, no one can deny that they are refreshingly original."

THE RATIONALE OF ASTROLOGY, by P.N. Oak, price Rs. 12. 50, is a very simple and enchanting guide to Indian astrology It also explains how astrology is a consumate science based squarely on physics, mathematics and astronomy. A chapter in it elucidates how the so-called Kutub Minar was raised by King Vikramaditya to commemorate the beginning of the Vikram Era. It formed the central tower of a pre-eminent ancient Hindu observatory of times when Indians ruled a large part of the world. The book has been unanimously acclaimed as a unique contribution to scientific astrology. Some typical comments are :

The Hindu (English dailyfrom madras), June 9, 1968: The arguments used in this book are novel and thought-provoking. (The book gives) simple rules which enable a student to have a good grip of the subject. Printing and get-up are good. All lovers of astrology will find this book useful."

The Mail (English daily fom Madras), June 29, 1968 : The Rational of Astrology explains in simple and clear language the basis of the astrological predictions and the fundamental characteristics of each planet posited in the different constellations at the time of birth of an individual besides explaining the methods of casting a horoscope and calculating the dasas."

AN APPEAL TO THE READER

A persual of the foregoing pages should have convinced you of the extent to which Indian history (and consequently world history in some portions) has been distorted.

Two of our earlier books: The Taj Mahal is a Hindu Palace, and Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research, highlight some other serious flaws in Indian and world history.

This task of rebutting our maimed and distorted history should, in fact, be undertaken by our universities and historical research organizations. But since no one was coming forward to rectify it, the Institute for Rewriting Indian History was founded (on June 14, 1964) as a public body to undertake that onerous but noble, national task.

The Institute has only about Rs. 9,000/- in its account with the Bank of Baroda, Connaught Circus, New Delhi (as on July 1, 1968).

In his letter dated August 2, 1939 Dr. Einstein informed the American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt that he had the know-how to make the atom bomb if the United States Government wanted to make use of it. All that he needed then was manufacturing and testing facility. Likewise we have now the know-how to rebut maimed and distorted Indian, and, to some extent, world history. It is now up to the public to make available to us the necessary facility by raising a

sizeable fund with which many scholar writers could be employed to rewrite the distorted portions and supply the missing chapters of history.

The Institute needs at least Rs. 500,000 immediately so that from their interest the Institute may employ at least two wholetime scholars to :—

1. Write at least 50 books on different mediaeval towns, buildings, bridges, canals and forts proving that they are pre-Muslim Hindu constructions fraudulently or inadvertantly ascribed to Muslim invaders and occupiers. 2. Publish several books proving the falsity of the so-called Indo-Saracenic theory of architecture. 3. Publish translated and annotated editions of at least a thousand mediaeval Muslim and European chronicles to bring to the surface very valuable evidence so far suppressed or ignored. For instance Shahjahan's own "Badshahnama" and Tavernier's "Travels in India" contain emphatic assertions that the Taj Mahal existed prior to Mumtaz's death. 4. Write hundreds of books throwing light on some unknown facets such as underestimated antiquity of Lord Buddha and Shankaracharya by 1300 years, Alexander's rout in India, and misconception about the Aryans being a race. 5. Write books countrywise for almost every country of the world pointed out the still discernible traces of one-time Indian Kshatriya rule over them. 6. Publish books language-wise to prove that most languages derive from Sanskrit. 7. Publish a magazine to keep the readers in touch with the findings of this new far-reaching research in world history and human civilization.

We appeal to all big and small, rich and poor, men and women, Indian or non-Indian to send in their mite for this great cause of truth and knowledge so that at least posterity may be saved from being fed with false facts, and tutored in fanciful, half-baked theories.

At least until some big donors come forward or the Government and universities realize their responsibility in this field, we look to folk of ordinary means to become members by paying 10 rupees a year or enrol as life-members by contributing Rs. 300/- once for all (either in lump sum or within 12 months in instalments). Donations from infinitesimal to infinite amounts are also earnestly solicited.

Members/donors are entitled to a discount on books written by Institute members or published by the Institute. Publications may be ordered per VPP.

The Institute has thousands of books to publish, which will change the entire orientation of Indian history and to a considerable extent of world history. Your financial support is of vital importance in this great task of rebutting history which is at present being grossly misrepresented to generations of students, visitors to historical buildings and to the world at large.

Please enrol as a member, send a donation whenever you can, and order our publications. Also persuade your friends to render similar help.

This painting depicting (Akbar's father) Humayun with his nobles at Fathpur should explode the myth that Akbar founded Fatehpur Sikri. The painting is apparently of a period when Akbar was not even born. Akbar was born during Humayun's exile (1540—55). Humayun returned to Delhi in July 1555 and died within six months. Page 62, Vol. IV, Elliot & Dowson, clearly mentions that Fathpur means Fatehpur Sikri. On page 157 of our book Badayuni has also been quoted referring to Fatehpur Sikri as Fathpur during Akbar's own time. Visitors to that township, archaeology officials and students and teachers of history must not hereafter mislead themselves and others about the origin of Fatehpur Sikri. It was an Hindu capital founded centuries before Akbar. That is why its buildings are entirely of the Hindu design.

This painting depicting (Akbar's father) Humayun with his nobles at Fathpur should explode the myth that Akbar founded Fatehpur Sikri. The painting is apparently of a period when Akbar was not even born. Akbar was born during Humayun's exile (1540—55). Humayun returned to Delhi in July 1555 and died within six months. Page 62, Vol. IV, Elliot & Dowson, clearly mentions that Fathpur means Fatehpur Sikri. On page 157 of our book Badayuni has also been quoted referring to Fatehpur Sikri as Fathpur during Akbar's own time. Visitors to that township, archaeology officials and students and teachers of history must not hereafter mislead themselves and others about the origin of Fatehpur Sikri. It was an Hindu capital founded centuries before Akbar.

Some other works by the Author

1. Fatehpur Sikri is a Hindu City
2. Delhi's Red Fort is Hindu Lalkot
3. Lucknow's Imambaras are Hindu Palaces
4. Agra Red Fort is a Hindu Building
5. Fowler's Howlers
6. Islamic Havoc in Indian History
7. धर्म तथा समाजवाद
8. भारत-गांधी नेहरू की छाया में
9. वर्तमान दुर्व्यवस्था का समाधान–हिन्दू राष्ट्र
10. मैं हिन्दू हूं (हिन्दू की मान्यताएं)
11. इतिहास में भारतीय परंपराएं
12. हिन्दू धर्म
13. भाव और भावना (संस्मरण)
14. वैदिक विश्वराष्ट्र का इतिहास (4 भाग)
15. भारत में मुस्लिम सुल्तान (2 भाग)
16. कौन कहता है अकबर महान् था?
17. ताजमहल मन्दिर भवन है
18. भारतीय इतिहास की भयंकर भूलें
19. विश्व इतिहास के विलुप्त अध्याय
20. Some Blunders of Indian Historical Research

Who Says Akbar was Great?

The Present day historians consider Akbar as a great Moghul emperor. The author of this book questions this view. He quotes innumerable incidents and deeds of the so called great emperor and proves that Akbar was the greatest rogue. A well decumented work worth reading....